

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 396.—OCTOBER, 1903.

Art. I.—SOPHOCLES AND THE GREEK GENIUS.

1. *Sophocles: the Plays and Fragments, with critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose.* By Sir R. C. Jebb, Litt.D., M.P. Seven parts. Cambridge: University Press, 1883-1896.
2. *Sophocles.* Translated and explained by J. S. Phillimore, M.A. London: Allen, 1902.
3. *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, with a critical text and translation of the Poetics.* By S. H. Butcher, Litt.D. Third edition. London: Macmillan, 1902.

'Fortunate Sophocles! with wealth and wit
Together blest he lived, and full of days
He died; his many tragedies were fair,
And fair his end, before the evil hour.'

So, at the death of the great Attic tragedian, sang the comic poet Phrynichus, one of his younger contemporaries; and after-ages have always dwelt on the same characteristics, which are indeed singular and signal.

The 'lives' of poets are only too often some of the saddest reading in the world. Truly they seem to have 'learned in suffering' what they have 'taught in song,' and to have poured out their bitter-sweet notes, like the legendary nightingale, with their bosom against the thorn. Want, exile, passion ill-assorted, unhappy marriage, feuds with friend and foe, melancholy and madness, *sæva indignatio*, the pangs of envy or of sensitiveness, an early or a tragic end—these have been too often their lot. Glory is theirs, but purchased at what a price!

Some exceptions there have been—Sophocles, Virgil, Chaucer, Shakespeare probably, Ariosto, Goethe, Tennyson; and conspicuous among the exceptions is Sophocles. Both the ancient and the modern world have agreed to account him among the very happiest of all poets, happy in his era, happy in the circumstances of his life, happiest above all in his own sweet and sage temper; 'the happiest of all Greek poets on record,' as Swinburne called him long since; the 'gentle Sophocles,' as, by a felicitous transference of Ben Jonson's well-known epithet for his immortal friend, he styled him the other day.

Other contemporaries who were able to look back on the career of Sophocles echo the same note as Phrynichus. Aristophanes, whose glorious, graceless comedy spared no one else, spared him. The motive of the 'Frogs' is, as every one knows, the proposal to recover for Athens, now sadly shorn of poets, one of the great tragedians of the generation which had just passed away.

'Why do you not bring Sophocles back from the grave, if you want one of the dead poets on earth again?' says Heracles to Dionysus. 'Because, my dear sir, he will not come. He's too happy where he is, his sweet temper, his *bonhomie*, make him welcome everywhere. When he arrived in the lower regions he found his old friend and rival Æschylus enthroned. He only kissed him and clasped his hand, bidding him keep the throne, and so preserves his character still, "Serene in life and after life serene."'

And Plato, no lover of the poetic temperament, in the ever memorable opening of the 'Republic,' says the same, and uses the very same untranslatable epithet. He introduces Sophocles as an example of one who in his May of life had enjoyed gustful youth to the full, but who could grow old charmingly, with a resignation worldly at once and unworldly. Well balanced and 'serene,' when one asked him, 'How is it with you, Sophocles? Are you still the man you were?' 'Hush! hush!' he said, 'we must not use such talk. Rather I have gladly escaped from the tyranny of a wild and mad master.'

Doubtless he had escaped from other tyrannies and torments. Even he must have had his struggles. Good fortune brings its own enemies, its own friction of envy and detraction. Life had not always been smooth. He had

not always been successful. His greatest play only won the second prize: once the Archon would not grant him a chorus at all. Gossip and scandal had gabbled and hissed around him. Lesser men, minor poets and interviewers, had presented him in their belittling mirror. It may be his own kin had sought to push him from his throne and try on his royal crown before his death. One of the comic poets called his poems literally 'dog rimes,' and said he seemed in writing his plays 'to have collaborated with a barking hound.'

It is true that the details of his life must remain dubious, for the record is scanty and mainly traditional. But, on the whole, tradition, in such matters once discredited, has rather recovered than lost authority. Such evidence as that of Plato and Aristophanes gives fixed points of light; and the broad facts remain, especially that of his relation to the evolution of the Greek drama.

Æschylus, with his nobly grandiose magniloquence like 'the large utterance of the early gods,' Æschylus, whose

'Bronze-throat eagle-bark at blood
Has somehow spoilt my taste for twitterings';

Sophocles, with the perfection of his art; Euripides, with his romance and novelty—they are all Greek, and they are all great. It is, however, of the essence of Sophocles, it is the secret and the sum of his happiness, to hold in everything the middle position. He was born just at the right moment. The peculiar glory of Athens falls entirely within a single century—the fifth before Christ. The date 500 B.C. found her still undeveloped, 400 B.C. left her ruined. The first two decades were decades of gloom and struggle. Marathon staved off the onset of the East; but it was only after Salamis and Plataea that the Persian peril ceased to be an ever-present overwhelming terror. It was between the two naval battles, Salamis and Ægospotami, that the brief splendid day of Athens flamed and fell. The fifty years between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars were its high noon. These years are the years of Sophocles. Salamis, the greatest land-mark in the political history of Athens—in some ways of the ancient world—is also the most notable in her literary history.

'From Marathon to Syracuse
Are seventy years and seven; for so long
Endured that city's prime which was the world's.'

In the battle of Salamis, and in the van of the fray, Æschylus fought, as he had fought before at Marathon. Its glorious agony lives for ever in the surging, glittering rhythms of the *Persæ*, which ring as though Marlowe had sung the story of the Armada in the mighty line in which he had the year before given to the stage 'Tamburlaine the Great.' On the day of the battle Euripides, according to tradition, was born. And what of Sophocles? His part was neither purely active nor purely passive, but eminently notable and suitable. Neither the woes nor the throes of the victory were his. He was chosen for his beauty and his promise, as the prize-boy of the classroom and the playing-field, to lead the choristers who sang and danced in celebration of the crowning mercy. The picture is one which appeals to the imagination. Sophocles, afterward to be the ideal Greek man, is here the ideal Greek boy.

'There the ancient celebration to the maiden queen of fight
Led the long august procession upward to the pillared height:
There the hearts of men beat faster while the glad Hellenic
boy
Ran and wrestled with his fellows, knew the struggle and the
joy;
From the deep eyes in his forehead shone a radiance brave
and fair,
Flashing down his shapely shoulders ran the splendour of his
hair.'

It is thus he first comes upon the world-stage; and the appearance is significant.

For one thing is certain, that he had received that first of gifts, a good education. It seems probable that his father Sophillus was of a middle station in life. Some have put him too low and called him a blacksmith or ironmonger; others, on the ground that his son in later life held office in the state, have imagined that he must have been of good family. Probably he was neither, but was a well-to-do *bourgeois*, keeping a small manufacturing business, such as Demosthenes' father kept a century later. In Athens, as elsewhere, the sons of such

men have had perhaps the best of all starts in life. What is clear is that Sophillus gave his son the completest training then available. In particular his master in music and dancing, Lamprus, was the first and most fashionable teacher of the time.

That the young poet was beautiful and clever, that he was graceful and agile and athletic, is vouched for by the story we have recalled. It is vouched for again later on in his life. He sustained the title-rôle in his own piece 'Nausicaa,' embodying the story of that most delightful of Homeric heroines. In a charming scene, as every one remembers, she leads her maidens in a combination of dance and ball-play. Sophocles threw the ball, as the Greek expression was, in 'topping' style. In another of his own pieces, 'Thamyris,' he played the lyre; but he gave up acting because his voice was thin and weak. All this, however, came later in his career. Meanwhile his boyhood was like that of any other Athenian gentleman's son. His home was the most beautiful spot in the neighbourhood of Athens, a 'garden' not 'wholly in the busy world nor quite beyond it,' the Horseman's Knoll, as it was called—the 'White Knoll' as he himself styles it—a low mound of light-coloured earth, swelling from the Attic plain, and covered with a boskage of laurel, olive, and vine, through which trickled the unfailing rills of the little Kephissus, nourishing the daffodil, 'a garland for the gods,' and the gold-gleaming crocus, and keeping fresh the green dells in which a crowd of nightingales sang sweetly and unceasingly.

Of the poet's earlier manhood, from 480 to 468, we know nothing. He is called the pupil of Æschylus, as a great Italian painter is often called the pupil of his chief predecessor. That Æschylus gave, or Sophocles received, lessons, is not to be believed; but that, as a happy reverent spirit, he fell at first much under the influence of Æschylus and learned from him, there can be no doubt. The 'Ajax,' one of his earliest plays, is full of Æschylean words, taken mainly, as Professor Jebb notices, from the Persæ; and it was perhaps with mingled feelings that he found himself preferred at the age of twenty-seven to his master. The story of the victory is well known, although of doubtful truth. What it emphasises is, that from this time Sophocles undoubtedly held the foremost place among

Athenian poets. So much is clear from Aristophanes. The old men might prefer Æschylus, the young men Euripides, but Sophocles was *hors concours*. Such was doubtless the judgment of the generals, even if the story of their award is not true. It was, as Professor Phillimore well puts it, the judgment of 'the man in the street of Athens.'* It was also the judgment of Xenophon and, perhaps we may divine, of Plato. And it was to be the judgment of Cicero and Virgil, and of that still more popular critic, Ovid.

Sophocles acquired, too, a public position. He was sent as a general to Samos about 441. It has been argued that this means little, especially as regards his poetry. It is not so clear that this is the case. Professions were not then so much differentiated as they are to-day. Every Greek gentleman was bred to arms and familiar with the simple conduct of war as at that time carried on. Sophocles might well have been, if Greek comedy is to be trusted, as good a general as Pericles. It is true that Ion of Chios, in his 'Reminiscences,' entitled perhaps 'Celebrities I have met,' gives a gossiping, and not unscandalous account of his encountering Sophocles at a dinner-party in Samos, and how he displayed his generalship in manœuvring at the dinner-table. 'I am practising tactics,' he said, 'because Pericles says I am a good poet but a bad general.' But Ion, Plutarch tells us, also described Pericles as 'stiff and proud,' and indeed thought it right to show the seamy side of great men. It is said more specifically that Sophocles was defeated in a naval skirmish by the famous atomic philosopher Melissus. Fancy a campaign conducted by Gladstone and Tennyson, in which Tennyson should be defeated at sea by M. Pasteur!

A figure and a personage, then, in Greek society, the compeer of Pericles, the friend of Herodotus, to whom he addressed an ode, he ranged among the foremost men and minds of his day, interchanging with them, doubtless as an equal, ideas on the events and movements of his time. Whatever he was in the field, it is certain that his

* Aristophanes ('Peace' 531) makes one of his chorus include, as one of the blessings of peace, 'the songs of Sophocles.' The scholiast says Aristophanes praised Sophocles only to damn Euripides, whom he hated. But he doubtless also represents the popular taste.

poems contain much political wisdom. Such passages as the famous

'Stone walls do not a city make, but men';

or again,

'Since neither fort nor fleet empty is anything,
Desert of men to be its complement,'

have passed into proverbs for every age and time. They gave him the reputation for that aphoristic eloquence or mastery of phrase which Plutarch attributes to him. He held a position not unlike that of Tennyson, who could venture to advise Gladstone about the extension of the franchise, and whose phrases or 'sayings' are the crystallisation of the political wisdom of his time. It was the same cause, doubtless, which led to his being made a 'Lord of the Treasury,' and being employed, like an American man of letters, Hawthorne, or Motley, or Lowell, on various embassies. In the last years of his life, when, after the awful calamity of Syracuse, the democracy was discredited and an attempt was made to frame a new constitution with a more restricted franchise, an assembly was summoned, not in Athens, but at his own Colonus, by which he is said to have been appointed one of a committee of ten, to devise a new constitution and submit it to the people. The result was the appointment of the famous or notorious Four Hundred. The identification is doubtful, but the story preserved by Aristotle, that he defended the course adopted by saying that it was not indeed ideal, but the best under the circumstances, is quite in keeping with his character.

For he was probably a moderate in politics as in everything else, and meant the Four Hundred to be merely an executive committee and not the tyrannical *junta* which it proved. As R. A. Neil, of lettered memory, writes in his most suggestive introduction to the 'Knights,' the spirit of Attic literature is in the main that of moderate, not extreme, democracy. Sophocles was in any case a patriot, and even when Athens had seen her best days remained faithful to her. Euripides, also a democrat, but disillusioned—'exacerbated' by the jingoism, as Dr Murray implies, though he cleverly avoids saying it, of the Athenian democracy—fled to the court of Archelaus of Macedonia, which was like taking refuge with Peter

the Great of Russia, and there composed that swan-song, strangely, wildly beautiful, which Dr Murray has reproduced with so much genius and sympathy, the 'Bacchæ.' Sophocles was also invited by the despot, but he would not go. Then came 'the sombre close of that voluptuous day.' Euripides died. When Sophocles heard it he put on mourning and bade his chorus appear without the usual wreaths. The scene is admirably given by one of Euripides' best lovers, Mr Browning :—

'Enters an old pale-swathed majesty
Makes slow mute passage through two ranks as mute.

Priest—the deep tone succeeded the fixed gaze—
Thou carest that thy god have spectacle
Decent and seemly ; wherefore I announce
That, since Euripides is dead to-day,
My Choros, at the Greater Feast, next month,
Shall clothed in black appear ungarlanded.
Then the grey brow sank low, and Sophokles
Re-swathed him, sweeping doorward ; mutely passed
'Twixt rows as mute, to mingle possibly
With certain gods who convoy age to port ;
And night resumed him.'

His own end followed just in time, 'before the evil hour.' The story of the manner of his death and of his burial are both significant. The better versions of the first are pretty, the legend of the last is lovely, but chronology pronounces it apocryphal.

It was indeed time for him to depart. His domestic relations were too probably not happy. Like Goethe after Schiller's death and the shock and sequel of the battle of Jena, marrying Christiana Vulpius, flirting and quarrelling with Bettine, incurring the contempt and censure of his family, the old and over-amorous Sophocles had perhaps fallen into the hands of an old man's young wives. They preyed upon him, perching on his house, as the forcible Greek saying had it, like owls on a tomb. Whether his sons ever really brought the famous action *de lunatico inquirendo* which was dismissed upon Sophocles reciting the song from the 'Œdipus at Colonus,' is doubtful, though Cicero, a lover of a good story, accepted it. It is very probably a scene from a comedy, based perhaps on

an exaggeration of the real state of Sophocles' relations with his family.

Browning's verses strike the true note of his passing, a note taken from no other source than this play itself. For Sophocles was a many-sided character. He was not only a soldier and a statesman; he was a priest, or something very like it, in the technical sense. Like Dante, who was inscribed of the Guild of Apothecaries, he seems to have had some connexion with medicine; he reared an altar and wrote a hymn to Asclepius, the god of medicine, which long remained famous. But he also held a sort of private prebend or priesthood in connexion with Alcon, a brother hero with Asclepius. He was even supposed to have entertained Asclepius, and after death was himself canonised as 'The Entertainer.'

This, too, is appropriate to his character. For not merely was he religious, but he was definitely pious. A poet, and especially a dramatist, must not be judged by isolated passages or sentiments put into the mouths of his characters; but the whole temper of Sophocles shows this, and the tradition that he came into collision with the *esprits forts* of his day, and offended them by his avowed orthodoxy, is verisimilar enough. We know little about the so-called 'Mysteries,' or the place they held in actual Greek thought and life. But one of the most famous passages about them is a fragment of Sophocles, in which he attributes to them a saving grace.

'Thrice happy,' he sang, 'are they among mortals who have looked on these rites before they pass to the world below. They alone will have life in the next world, the rest will have there nought but misery.'

The eminent German scholar, von Wilamowitz-Möllerndorf, lays special stress on Sophocles' piety as emphasised by these stories, and thinks it the key to the understanding of the 'Œdipus Tyrannus.'

'We' (he says) 'are smitten to the ground by the awfulness of the story. Sophocles was not so. He had a warm piety in the heart of a child. The weakness of man was to him only God's opportunity. He believed in the gods as he believed in the oracles. Such piety is not found in Æschylus. Can we doubt that Augustine would have found in Sophocles, and not in his two comrades, a kinsman of heaven?'

Such his own generation certainly held him. He was beyond all others, they said, the darling of the gods.

Is such a character, so sensuous at once and saintly, intelligible or realisable by us to-day? The poetic temperament sometimes takes this cast. In this, as in other points, there is not a little resemblance between the 'gentle' Sophocles, and the tender, pious Virgil, a wizard in his own and immediately succeeding days, a saint in the Middle Ages. We have compared him, too, with a poet who has much in common with Virgil, Lord Tennyson.* But he has also many points of contact with another poet, very different from either of these. It is said that Sophocles has no modern parallel, and strictly speaking this is true. The nearest perhaps, on the whole, or at least the most suggestive, as we have already hinted more than once, is Goethe. The differences are very great. Germany is not Greece. Neither Frankfurt nor Weimar, nor both combined, are Athens. Yet in the man Goethe, in his temper, in his physique, there is much that helps us to understand Sophocles.

Born in a middle station, strikingly handsome, both in youth and age, mingling passion and reason, familiar with affairs as well as books, prosecuting art and culture and science, and all amid the storm and thunder of a national struggle and mighty battles, minded ever 'Im Ganzen, Guten, Schönen, resolut zu leben,' to him also may be applied Matthew Arnold's famous lines about one

'Whose even-balanced soul
From first youth tested up to extreme old age,
Business could not make dull, nor passion wild,
Who saw life steadily and saw it whole.'

Nor is it unlikely that their author in writing them had, perhaps unconsciously, in his mind both his artistic and literary heroes. The picture of Goethe with his sunny playfulness of wit and temper, as portrayed for us by Eckermann, may help us to understand the picture of Sophocles, already alluded to, preserved by a less flattering witness than Eckermann, Ion of Chios. The famed com-

* Professors Campbell, Butcher, and Phillimore, have all pointed out the similarity of Sophocles' style to that of Virgil and Tennyson, especially in its trick of giving to a word a sort of *aura* of association, and thus many meanings at once.

bination of *Heiterkeit*, 'blithe serenity,' with *Allgemeinheit*, or 'breadth of view,' makes in both, though in very different forms, a complete ideal; while the deeper side of Goethe, that piety which all his sensual worldliness could not entirely obliterate, may be found in the treatment of religion in 'Wilhelm Meister,' both in the story of the *Schöne Seele*, and still more in the symbolic and mystic interpretation of Christianity which concludes the miscellaneous phantasmagoria of that strange book.

The social status of the two poets presents a further parallel.

'Placed midway between the perilous extremes of affluence and want, Goethe's whole career received a modifying impulse from this position. He never knew adversity. This alone must necessarily have deprived him of one powerful chord which vibrates through literature. He never knew the gaunt companionship of Want, whispering terrible suggestions. He never knew the necessity to conquer for himself breathing-room in the world; and thus all the feelings of bitterness, opposition, and defiance which accompany and perplex the struggle of life, were to him almost unknown; and he was taught nothing of the aggressive and practical energy which these feelings develop in impetuous natures. How much of his serenity, how much of his dislike to politics may be traced to this origin?'

So writes his English biographer, Mr G. H. Lewes, in the opening pages of his book.

Goethe, again, had his acquaintance with affairs, both civil and military. He was a Privy Councillor at five-and-twenty; and, just before he wrote his 'Iphigeneia,' he was appointed President of the Military and Causeway Commission for the Duchy of Weimar, so that he composed that famous piece, as he said, with 'one foot only in the stirrup of Pegasus.' He was interrupted in its composition by the riots among the starving weavers of Apolda. When it was first acted, he played the part of Orestes himself, and in the handsome prime of his young manhood—he was then just thirty—was likened to Apollo descended from heaven to represent bodily the beauty of Greece. Truly a Sophoclean apparition! It is of no little importance that both poets were practically and personally acquainted with the details and difficulties of staging and presentation. In this respect Sophocles was pre-eminent.

His famous introduction of the third actor, his breaking-down of the practice of writing 'tetralogies,' or cycles, rather than single plays, like his improvements in dress and decoration, owe, doubtless, something to this converseance with the actual possibilities. It is noticeable that Goethe, in criticising Sophocles, lays special stress on this acquaintance with the stage, as shown in both the 'Philoctetes' and the 'Œdipus at Colonus.' It is pretty clear too that, like Aristotle, nay, probably following both Aristotle and Lessing, he took Sophocles as the norm and canon of Greek tragedy. Thus in his critique of 'Cymbeline,' the reviewer of Shakespeare, he says, should consider how Sophocles would have handled the same material.

Finally, Goethe reminds us of Sophocles in his blending of reason and passion. He was eminently susceptible to beauty, and he yielded often, too often, to its spell. He was aware of this himself. Is not his confession,

‘Ich könnte viel glücklicher sein
Gäb's nur keinen Wein
Und keine Weiberthränen,’

in the same key as Sophocles' famous answer already quoted? And might not Sophocles have replied to Ion in Goethe's line,

‘Wird doch nicht immer geküsst, es wird vernünftig
gesprochen?’

Goethe resembled Sophocles, too, in his magnanimity and sweetness to other artists and poets, first and foremost to Schiller, but also to lesser lights, Herder and Wieland, Jacobi and others. ‘How could I write songs of hatred without hating,’ said Goethe. Yet he wrote the *Xenien*. ‘Such was Sophocles' charm,’ says his biographer, ‘that everywhere and by every one he was beloved.’ Yet he could use his tongue on occasion; and did we possess all his works we might find perhaps that he too not only could have written, but wrote his occasional *Xenien*; or perhaps, like Tennyson, he only composed and did not publish his epigrams on his foes.*

The luck of some men seems to follow them even

* An epigram on Euripides attributed to him is still extant.

after their death. Their happy star shines over their graves. This has been the case with Sophocles. It is true, of course, that the bulk of his plays has been lost, that only seven have survived. But they are all masterpieces. Time does not always scatter his poppy so blindly as is supposed. Macaulay raised the issue, whether Euripides would not have been rated more highly had only the seven best of his dramas come down to us; and much as we must deplore the loss of many a famous piece by Sophocles, yet when we read the list of the names of the hundred and fifteen whose names survive we cannot avoid the surmise that, were they all more than names, we might better have understood that 'unevenness' and that 'artificiality' at which great ancient critics stumbled. It is true also that Sophocles' fame has not perhaps stood always equally high. He was too essentially Hellenic, nay, too Attic, for the cosmopolitan Hellenistic days which followed the break-up of old Greece. Euripides, far easier to understand, had probably a much wider vogue throughout the semi-Greek world. It was the 'Bacchæ,' and not the 'Œdipus' or the 'Antigone' that was being acted at the Parthian court when the head of the unfortunate Crassus was brought in and snatched up by the strolling player to point the wild Bacchant's refrain. Both Æschylus and Euripides have had perhaps more passionate partisans; but Sophocles has been the favourite of the best critics, of Aristotle and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Dio Chrysostomus, of Cicero and Virgil, of Lessing and Goethe, of Matthew Arnold and of Edward Fitzgerald.

It is true that his luck has not been absolutely unbroken. It is a misfortune that Lessing never completed his work upon him. Lessing, in the prime of his powers, meditated a great study of Sophocles, whom he wished to hold up as a model to German dramatists. It was to consist of four books. The first was to contain a life of the poet, which was to be followed by a critical analysis of the plays and a translation. Lessing began with the life, and commenced printing it in 1760; but he had not enough material ready, and the printing was discontinued with the seventh sheet. Fourteen years later he took it up again, but once more failed to complete it. Even now, after the lapse of nearly a century and a half,

we must regret that Lessing did not achieve what he projected, for he combined what are so rarely combined in adequate measure, passion and erudition. He was not a poet who had failed, but rather a critic who had succeeded in creative literature; and the author of 'Minna von Barnhelm' and the 'Hamburgische Dramaturgie' might have given us in a life of Sophocles a supplement to his own 'Laokoon' and a complement to the 'Poetics.'

Lessing was not a Sophoclean character; few have been less so; but he would have treated a great poet as only a great poet can. His *obiter dicta* upon Sophocles are excellent. His general attitude and feeling are best expressed in his own noble words:—

'Let us,' he says, 'once fall in love with an ancient author and then the most trifling detail which concerns, or which can have any reference to that author, ceases to be indifferent to us. Now that I have once begun to regret having studied the "Poetics" of Aristotle without first studying the pattern from which he derived it, I shall pay more attention to the name of Sophocles, let me find it where I will, than to my own. How often have I sought him, how much useless stuff have I read for his sake! To-day my thought is, No trouble is in vain which can save trouble to another. I have not read the useless uselessly if it prevents one and another from having to read it hereafter. I may not be admired, but I shall be thanked. And imagined gratitude is as pleasant as imagined admiration; or we should have had no grammarians, no scholars.'

But if Sophocles was unlucky in the eighteenth century, he has been lucky in the nineteenth and twentieth. Neither Æschylus nor Euripides, strange to say, has yet found a great or even an adequate editor. Famous scholars have dealt with single plays. Porson meditated at different times both an Æschylus and a Euripides, but he had not the moral stamina in his short ill-starred life to achieve either, admirable as is his work on both. Sophocles has been happier. He has found an editor, of whom it is not too much to say that he is not only ideal, but also ideally appropriate to his author; and he has found him at the right moment.

Of scholarship in the literary and linguistic sense, Sir Richard Jebb is a past master, and he has been trained in the best school. Classical study may progress on

various lines, in comparative philology, in palæography, in archæology. New materials may be unearthed. In these ways there may be an advance, but in another direction there may very well be a decline. It may be doubted whether the command of Greek verse composition, with all it implies, will ever be carried higher, or indeed maintain itself so high as it has stood among the Oxford and Cambridge scholars of Sir Richard Jebb's day. Sir Richard is himself one of those men with a gift for language as such, which comes perhaps twice in a century, and he has practised it carefully and long. He is a consummate composer of Greek verse. He can, as Tennyson said, 'roll an Olympian "that seems to come from some very ghost of Pindar" within him.' His iambic translations of Shakespeare show a wealth and command of Greek diction which is marvellous. But he is more than a mere composer, rhetorician, or versifier. He is much of an orator and a poet. He is also a practised literary critic. He has enjoyed the friendship of living poets, the intimate friendship of the foremost and most artistic of his day. He possesses what Dryden so well said was necessary to give a really correct understanding of style, and to 'wear off the rust contracted by learning,' a knowledge of men and manners. Nay more, he is conversant with affairs; nor is it extravagant to say that, as Gibbon found—the reader, says Gibbon, may smile—'the captain of the Hampshire grenadiers not useless to the historian of the Roman empire,' so the Royal Commissioner and the Cambridge Burgess may have been useful to the Cambridge Professor of Greek, regarded as the editor of the Attic dramatist who was also a soldier and a statesman. Diligent, accurate, well-balanced, judicious, sane, sympathetic, Sir Richard Jebb well fulfils Lessing's canon. He loves his author, and he has spared neither time nor pains in elucidating him.

Sir Richard Jebb's most famous predecessor in the Greek chair at Cambridge was a lover of Euripides. It is the custom at Cambridge that the candidates for the Greek chair should deliver, like a Scotch minister on trial, a public lecture in the schools upon some Greek author. Porson, when a candidate in 1792, chose Euripides for his theme, or perhaps the theme was proposed to

him. Whichever was the case, the choice was most fortunate. The lecture, brilliant both in matter and expression, is far less well known than it deserves to be. To the general reader it is, indeed, not known at all. The fact is that it is written in Latin, and general readers do not read literary criticism in Latin. The pity is that the author of the 'Letters to Travis' did not write more in English; for Porson was, like most really great scholars, like Bentley or Munro, a man of letters as well as a scholar, a master of literary as well as of textual criticism. He was also like not a few men of genius, procrastinating. The lecture was scrambled together, it is said, in two days. With consummate oratorical art he apologises for making it a popular discourse which may possibly please the undergraduates—after all, perhaps, not the worst of judges. It treats interestingly of all three tragedians, but culminates in a comparison of Sophocles and Euripides, which concludes by declaring the great scholar's own predilection.

'I,' he says, 'derive greater pleasure from the natural beauty and unaffected simplicity of Euripides than from Sophocles' more elaborate and artificial diligence. Sophocles may have indited the more correct tragedies, but Euripides wrote the sweeter poems. Sophocles we approve, but Euripides we adore; we praise the former, but we peruse the latter. "Hunc magis probare solemus, illum magis amare; hunc laudamus; illum legimus."'

To this opinion of Porson Sir Richard Jebb would not subscribe. His praise is for Euripides. 'All honour to Euripides,' he says, 'for no one is capable of feeling that Sophocles is supreme who does not feel that Euripides is admirable.' But his love is for Sophocles.

And to the *grand amore* he adds the *lungo studio*. The history of this edition is of high interest. As a young don of Trinity, six and thirty years ago, he first edited two plays, the 'Electra' and the 'Ajax.' Already he meditated a complete edition of Sophocles on a large scale. But he saw that he must first master Greek rhetorical prose. His work on the Attic orators was thus an interlude and a preparation for the edition of Sophocles. In its pages will be found some of his best general critical writing upon Sophocles. Only in 1883

was he able to publish the first volume of the larger edition. Thirteen years later, he once more gave to the world the second of the two plays with which he had begun, the 'Ajax.' With this the series of the plays is complete. It still remains for the eighth volume to be produced, which will contain the Fragments, Essays on subjects of general interest in relation to Sophocles, and an Index. It is to be hoped that it may also include a discussion of the life of Sophocles, for the notices about him are not few, and sympathetically and scientifically treated, as Professor Jebb could treat them, might be made to yield more than they have yet done.

But meanwhile Professor Jebb has a right to regard his task as, in a sense, achieved, and to inscribe it with a Dedication which is singularly appropriate. Whatever may be thought of Sophocles' failings in a pre-Christian age, not notable for either chastity or chivalry in the modern sense, Sophocles' women, the tender and the strong alike, are eminently noble and chivalrous creations; and the fact that he created them, and that they were so much admired in his own day, should go far to redeem the Periclean age from the imputation of a low opinion of the sex. It is then happy and not insignificant that this monumental edition should receive as its finishing ornament a dedication to Lady Jebb, 'to whose sympathy,' writes her husband, 'it has owed more than to any other aid.'

What, it may be asked, are the general character and aim of this edition? They could not be better described than they are in the quiet and modest profession made in the preface to the second play edited, the lovely 'Œdipus at Colonus.'

'It will be a sufficient reward,' it was there written, 'for much thought and labour if this edition is accepted by competent critics as throwing some new light on a play of great and varied beauty.' And again, 'One distinctive aim of the edition is thoroughness of interpretation in regard alike to the form and to the matter. . . . Rash conjecture constantly arises from defective understanding.'

Thoroughness of interpretation, conservatism, and sobriety in textual criticism—these are certainly its distinguishing marks. 'Rare as epic song,' says the

doyen of our living creative writers, himself no mean scholar, Mr George Meredith, 'is the man who is thorough in what he does. And happily so; for in life he subjugates us, and he makes us bondsmen to his ashes.' Professor Jebb has spared no pains to be thorough. There is no Sophoclean question which he has left untouched, few which he has not adorned. But, if the most thorough, he is also the most patient and modest of editors. With the richest gift for rewriting, the amplest powers of composing in the Sophoclean vein that any scholar ever possessed, he has been the most self-restrained of editors. Where he has emended, his suggestions carry all the more force. He has been most generous to the suggestions of others. But, as Professor Kaibel said long ago, his aim is to understand his author, not to gain repute by novelty. Occasionally he is content not to understand, to suspend his judgment; but this is only when all means of illumination have been tried. Palæography, metrical science, grammar, prosody, are pressed into service in the determination and elucidation of the text; history, archæology, geography, even botany, all contribute to the full interpretation and presentment of the author's meaning. The result is that we recover Sophocles, and understand him with a fullness unknown before.

Indeed, as the second of Professor Jebb's brilliant young successors in the Glasgow chair of Greek generously writes, his great edition is so complete and judicious that, for years to come, all Sophoclean criticism must be expressed in terms of differing or agreeing with him. And let those who are tempted to differ think many times, for it is only by degrees that the reader perceives how intimately penetrated with the Sophoclean spirit his editor is, how nice and just is his sympathy, how exhaustive his consideration.

What, then, is the Sophoclean spirit? What are the Sophoclean characteristics? Perfection of detail, yet subordination of the parts to the whole; calculation and rule, yet the freedom which rule alone can give; 'triumphant art, but art in obedience to law.' It is of the essence of Sophocles that he is an artist, and a critical and self-conscious artist. Here, again, he is like Goethe, who said he had never written a single page without

knowing how it came there. 'You do what is right in poetry,' he said to Æschylus, 'but without knowing why.' This was not, as some ancient pedants supposed, because Æschylus was addicted to drink. Æschylus was indeed intoxicated, but in a different manner. In a famous passage in the 'Poetics,' Aristotle divides poets into two classes—the 'finely gifted,' who are sympathetic and touched to fine issues, and the 'finely frenzied,' who are swept on by overmastering inspiration.* Æschylus belongs to the latter class, Sophocles emphatically to the former. Not, indeed, that Æschylus is not a great artist, or that Sophocles is uninspired; but, like Shakespeare, and even more than Shakespeare, Sophocles is 'a great poet, made as well as born.' He has thought out his art. That this was so as regards both his style and his general management, we know. His style is described by the great critic Dionysius as the 'middle style,' a mean between the austere and the elegant. And it was a mean deliberately arrived at. In his youth, he used to say, he had 'dallied awhile with the pomp of Æschylus, then he had experimented in the other extreme, with his own inclination to harshness and hard elaboration, finally, he had exchanged both for a third style, which was the most sympathetic and the best.† So Shakespeare, as Mr Swinburne has admirably shown, halted between the following of Marlowe and that of Greene.

Still more significant is his use of the chorus. Originally the Greek play was all chorus. At first only one actor, then two, then three, but never more than three, except as mute personages, at one time upon the stage. What the early Greek plays were like may still be seen in that archaic drama the 'Suppliants' of Æschylus, or the still earlier 'Persæ.' Æschylus made the drama, Sophocles perfected it. His chorus was another person in the drama, a 'collective actor,' but something more than an actor. In the chorus the spectator sees himself brought into the scope of the piece, and his sympathy

* It is satisfactory to think that, as Professor Butcher shows in the preface to his new edition, the text in this important passage has now, by a comparison of the Arabic version, been placed beyond a doubt.

† Virgil's style was described, but by his enemies, in almost exactly the same terms, as being 'neither swelling nor meagre, but a subtle and mannered manipulation of ordinary language.'

is strongly drawn out. Aristotle takes Sophocles' use as the model of perfection. But Sophocles did not arrive at it without careful study. His evolution of the chorus was probably one of his earliest efforts, very possibly his first great artistic struggle. Perhaps the most interesting point in the very scanty record we possess of Sophocles is that he wrote a prose treatise about the chorus referring to and combating the views and practice of the older writers, Thespis and Chœrilus. The statement has, it is true, been doubted, but it seems credible enough,* for Sophocles' use of the chorus, as contrasted with that of Euripides, is one of the points on which Aristotle lays special stress in the 'Poetics'; and there can be little doubt that the well-known passage in Horace, does little more than reflect the view of Aristotle.

We know so little about Sophocles, or about the mode of literary work in his day, that it is difficult to check many statements as to his studies or writings. It is probable, however, that the ways of poets and artists then were not very different from what they have been since his day. Sophocles was said to cull the beauties of all his predecessors and to exhibit at once daring variety, appropriateness, and sweetness. He was called 'the Attic bee,' some say for the last-named quality. That he was sweet is very true. He knew how necessary sweetness is to the best poetry. '*Nec satis est pulchra esse poemata, dulcia sunt.*' But he was not too sweet. Here, as ever, he hit the mean. A story, perhaps apocryphal, used to be current about Mr Swinburne, generous sometimes of his blame, but ever still more generous of his praise, and consequently as potent in criticism as in creation, that he said of Tennyson, Browning, and himself, 'Browning has body, and I have bouquet, but Tennyson has both.' An ancient poet-critic said by a similar metaphor of Sophocles, 'He is a wine neither sugary nor watery but dry and cordial.'

But the name was probably given to Sophocles as Horace gave it to himself, not so much for his sweetness as for his industry; for he was accused, as all careful and learned poets have been, of plagiarism; and indeed

* Lessing thinks, with probability, that it was in this same prose treatise that he recorded the evolution of his own style.

Philostratus of Alexandria wrote a book on his thefts. The charge, it is true, has not clung as it did to Virgil and Tennyson, because we have not the authors from whom he could be said to have drawn. The prayer of the Roman wit has for him been realised, 'Perierunt qui ante Sophoclem Sophoclea dixere.' But it is additional proof that he was a careful and a learned poet. Sir Richard Jebb * is all the more to be thanked for the assiduity with which he has sifted the dust-heap of *scholia* and *didascaliai* to discover the previous treatment of Sophoclean themes, and thereby demonstrated Sophocles' knowledge and originality.

The main characteristics of Sophocles' dramatic genius may, of course, best be seen by taking one of the plays as edited in this series. It might seem natural, perhaps, to select the 'Œdipus Tyrannus,' for this, as readers of the 'Poetics' are aware, is the model and typical Greek play. Its strength consists in its wonderful arrangement, to use Leonardo da Vinci's phrase, its *symmetria prisca*. The movement passes through a perfect and absolute curve, in which no point, not the smallest, is out of place, so that it is little exaggeration to say that not a line could be lost without disturbing the balance of the whole. The dramatic economy of which Porson spoke is here displayed at its highest. But the 'Œdipus Tyrannus,' typical as it is, is perhaps not so well suited for displaying Sophocles' merits as is the 'Antigone,' the play after all which has most impressed the modern world.

The 'Antigone' is one of the earliest plays preserved. It is not perfect in style. It exhibits a certain amount of harshness. But it belongs to the maturity of the poet's powers, the centre of his active life. What then are its characteristics? The story is of the simplest. A great situation, few motives, few actors; the conflict of a lesser duty, local, expedient, human, with one which is paramount, universal, divine; consistency, simplicity, fine psychology, these are its notes. The famous Dramatic Unities, reduced to rule by the French classical theatre, were not, as every one is now aware, known to the Greek theatre as rules. They are not contained in Aristotle.

* Professor Jebb's many parallels from previous writers, e.g. from Theognis, are, in this connexion, very suggestive.

They are merely the result of that simplification which is of the essence of the best Greek tragedy, and is nowhere better seen than in the 'Antigone.'

Sophocles, in what, as Goethe pointed out, was his usual manner, did not invent, he found the story. But his treatment of it is, as Sir Richard Jebb emphasises, his own. And notably his own is the happy use which he makes of a motive specially interesting to Athens, the burial of foemen slain in war. A sister, Antigone, insists on burying her brother who has come sword in hand against his native city, has been defeated and slain, and lies under the ban of what the Greeks would have considered a harsh and high-handed but not illegal or unpatriotic decree. It is her uncle, the father of her lover, who has issued the edict, and he forbids her under pain of death to bury the corpse. The law is against her, but a higher law bids her go forward. She persists, openly performs burial rites, is brought to justice and is doomed to die. Her lover sides with her, and pleads with the father, but in vain. She is condemned and haled away to be immured in a living tomb. Too late the father relents, and when he goes to release her, finds that she has hanged herself, and that her lover, his own son, has killed himself upon her dead body, while, as a crowning woe, his wife, the queen-mother, on hearing the news, herself commits suicide.

These are the factors, simple, elemental. To the Greeks the mere situation in itself was even more powerful than it is to-day. The great natural 'moments' of man's earthly career, birth, marriage, death, had for them a predominance which we do not in all moods realise, although burial, even now, is a question which not seldom stirs feelings deep and universal. But even for us, and for all time, the situation remains profoundly touching. It possesses the universality of the greatest masterpieces.

Antigone is one of the very greatest characters in literature because she is so natural and so complete. She is a queen in tragedy, but she is no tragedy queen; she is a heroine, but a human heroine; for, as Professor Jebb says, 'no other woman in Greek tragedy is either so human or so true a woman as the Antigone of Sophocles.' She is the strongest of strong characters where character needs

strength, but she is not in the smallest degree 'strong-minded.' She is only, as Goethe wrote, 'Die schwesterlichste der Seelen.' It is because she is so very woman, so true a sister, that she is also so true a sweetheart. Duty is paramount, but light and life and love are sweet, sweet with all the physical sweetness which they had for a healthy and honourable Greek girl, and she does not conceal her natural feelings. She says in effect,

'I could not love thee, dear, so much,
Loved I not honour more.'

But she is under no illusion. When the chorus launches the keenest dart of all, the taunt of her ill-starred heritage, she admits its sting. It is the sin of her house which has put her in this terrible dilemma and forces her to this choice of evils; for she sees with awful clearness that it is truly a choice of evils, and that there is much to be said for the sentence which dooms her. She will hold fast to the one thing that is certain, duty to a brother. That gives her, like Jephtha's daughter, 'strength that equals her desire'; but, like Jephtha's daughter, mourning because 'no fair Hebrew boy shall smile away her maiden blame among the Hebrew mothers,' she is not ashamed to weep, and bewail that death, not Hæmon, will be her groom. So, with surpassing power, with the reticent concentration of passion which marks a master's work, Sophocles focuses the clash of forces, brings into sharp contrast the bride-bed and the grave, throwing, in an incomparable lyric, the flush and rosy light of love across the pallor and dark of death—

'Love that no man conquer may,
Making goods and gear his prey;
Love whose bivouac is laid
In the blush of dreaming maid!'

Then follows the tragic *dénouement* already described.

Such is the 'Antigone.' It contains many memorable beauties, great *tirades*, lovely lyrics, grand lines, the immortal speech about the 'unwritten laws which are not of to-day or yesterday,' the apostrophe to the living tomb, the famous chorus on the ingenuity of man, the noble phrase, sweet, eminently Sophoclean, an admirable ex-

ample of what the ancients dwelt upon, his power of indicating a whole individuality in a word or two.

‘But I was born
A sister to men’s love and not their hate.’

Yet, it is not in these details in themselves, but in the great simple situations and movement, and the living force of character which bursts forth at every shifting touch of circumstance and situation, that the grandeur of the play consists.

Mastery of detail then, but still more passion and nobility, the intensity of passion, the elevation of generosity, are the prevailing notes of Sophocles. These last are what have attracted other poets at all times.

‘The world may like, for all I care,
The gentler voice, the cooler head,
That bows a rival to despair,
And cheaply compliments the dead.

Thanked, and self-pleased : ay, let him wear
What to that noble breast was due ;
And I, dear passionate Teucer, dare
Go through the homeless world with you.’

(*Ionica* : ‘*After reading Ajax*.’)

‘Antigone, the most sisterly of souls’ ; ‘Dear passionate Teucer’ :—Sophocles indeed moves the heart. His characters are men and women, not realistic, but idealistic, not indeed, as he himself said, men as they ordinarily are, but as they ought to be, as sometimes, in moments of exaltation, they would wish, nay, even attain to be, yet men and women still. ‘There is nothing in Euripides,’ wrote William Cory, the author of the lines just quoted, ‘comparable with the Neoptolemus of Sophocles.’ Sophocles is rhetorical, of course. Rhetoric and drama are near akin. The secret of oratory is ‘acting’ ; and one of the most striking characteristics of Shakespeare is his almost intolerable and blinding eloquence. The Greek drama was specially prone to rhetoric. ‘It is in this,’ said Goethe, ‘that the very life of the dramatic in general consists ; and it is the very thing in which Sophocles is so great a master.’ But rhetoric in Sophocles is kept in check. ‘Sophocles never *jaws* philosophy in the midst of

passion: all his speeches advance instead of retarding it,' said Edward Fitzgerald. Goethe noticed exceptions, and thought that the famous and disputed sophistical passage in the 'Antigone,' which he hoped would be proved spurious,* was one. And there are not wanting instances in which, just as Tennyson was apparently at one period of his career influenced by the realism of Browning, Sophocles has caught the rhetorical note of Euripides. But the verdict of Fitzgerald was the verdict of Athens, and is in the main true.

In yet another aspect in which Sophocles appeals to universal feeling and moves the heart, he holds again this middle place, namely, in his religion. He stands just at the point where superstition and free-thought meet. His is a rational religion. The happiest of men and poets, he has yet written some of the saddest of strains. When life has been at its best, he sings, 'twere something better not to be.' Not that this was necessarily his own feeling, but he understood the burden of this unintelligible world, unintelligible, almost unbearable, without some kind of accepting faith. This it was that made him dear to Matthew Arnold, whose airy persiflage concealed so many pious sighs, so much spiritual yearning. It might well have been expected that 'Euripides the human,' would have approved himself more to the 'liberalism' of the author of 'Literature and Dogma.' But it was not so. The 'Note-books' recently published confirm the evidence of the language and allusions and imitations scattered up and down his works, both prose and poetry alike, that it was Sophocles who 'propped in these bad times his soul.' Matthew Arnold, indeed, underestimated Sophocles on the religious side.

'Perhaps,' he writes, 'in Sophocles the thinking power a little overbalances the religious sense, just as in Dante the religious sense overbalances the thinking power.'

* Professor Jebb's treatment of this is an admirable instance of his fair and exhaustive method. May not the solution be that which is very probable in the case of the analogous passage in Sophocles' great Roman parallel Virgil—the passage about Helen in *Æn.* ii.—that it represents a rough draft of a speech by Sophocles, which he did not himself insert, but which was found in his remains, and introduced, not without tinkering, by a later and lesser hand? The lately discovered lines of Juvenal are very likely yet another instance of this same phenomenon.

This would hardly seem to be the truth. But whichever way the balance inclines, Matthew Arnold is in the main right. Sophocles is a strongly religious poet, and a notable and a reasonable teacher of the soul.

The greatest Greek art at all epochs in Greek history was popular. It was national; it was human; it appealed to national predilections, to the root-instincts of mankind, to their passions, to their 'admiration, hope, and fear.' It took common ground. To be simple and popular is to be most truly Greek, not to be academic, ingenious, precious, bizarre. This may be Alexandrine, it is not Homeric or Attic. And such pre-eminently is Sophocles, one of those 'moderate' spirits, pursuers of the middle way;

'A loather of the lawless crown
As of the lawless crowd';

a lover in all things of the Greek doctrine of 'the limit,' the 'neither too much nor too little'; asking in all things,

'Why should a man desire in any way
To vary from the kindly race of men,
Or pass beyond the goal of ordinance
Where all should pause, as is most meet for all?'

in religion accepting, doubting too, it may be, yet 'cleaving to the sunnier side of doubt,' in everything shunning 'the falsehood of extremes.' Such characters are by extreme men, in religion, in politics, in art, disliked; they are condemned as timid compromisers, dealers in commonplace, time-serving. But the sage at the top in other walks of life, taking broad views of men and things, the multitude at the bottom, with its elemental emotions, its innate piety and good sense, the 'subliminal conscience' of mankind in both, approves them. Chaucer, Raphael, Molière, Mozart, are all Greek in this sense.

For the Greek genius at its best shows, alike in literary and in plastic creation, one predominant characteristic, the happy blending of art and nature. For it, virtue, truth, beauty, all equally consist in the *juste milieu*, the golden mean between extremes. Proportion, rhythm, geometrical structure are its distinguishing marks, sculptural self-repression, architectural balance, chiselled precision.

'Come leave your Gothic worn-out story
 San Giorgio and the Redentore,
 I from no building gay or solemn
 Can spare the shapely Grecian column.

Maturer optics don't delight
 In childish, dim, religious light,
 In evanescent vague effects
 That shirk, not face, one's intellects;
 They love not fancies just betrayed
 And artful tricks of light and shade,
 But pure form nakedly displayed,
 And all things absolutely made.'

So, long ago now, wrote Clough, in a characteristic little piece which deserves to be read in its entirety. It is true, but it is not all the truth either in architecture or literature. Greek architecture was not, any more than Greek sculpture, so bare and cold as is often supposed. It was, in its living heyday, like that of our old Gothic cathedrals, rich and warm with colour. Greek sculpture had 'pure form'; it had 'all things absolutely made'; but it was instinct with natural play and freedom too. In one of the many illuminating passages in his book upon 'Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art,' which we have quoted already—a truly classic presentation of a classic—Professor Butcher dwells on this double characteristic of the Greek writers from the other side. 'Few nations,' he says, 'have taken more delight in weaving airy and poetic fiction apart from all reality, made out of nothing and ending nowhere.' But if few have been more full of fancy, few have been less fantastic. Lamb's 'Sanity of True Genius,' he goes on to say, is as conspicuous in the Greek drama as in Shakespeare. M. Maurice Croiset's verdict is just the same.

'Sophocle, dans la poésie lyrique, comme ailleurs, est toujours l'Hellène par excellence, chez qui la raison apparaît dans tout ce que créent l'imagination et le sentiment.'

The effect of Sir Richard Jebb's edition is to give us Sophocles as the type of this genuine Greek genius, in restoring him to us once more as he really was, no impossible ideal, but a genuine poet among poets, a living man among men, the child yet the master of his age. It

is the fashion to think of Sophocles as impersonal, statuesque, chaste, cold,

‘Faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null,
Dead perfection, no more.’

He is nothing of the kind. ‘Beneath the marble exterior of Greek literature,’ to use Professor Jowett’s words, ‘is concealed a soul thrilling with spiritual emotion.’ He has been called ‘classical in the vulgar sense.’ Classical in no vulgar sense indeed he is; classical with the classicism that is romantic too. He is romantic, as romantic at times as Spenser, if not as Shakespeare. Professor Phillimore, in his masculine and forcible introduction, brings into prominence his freshness, but speaks of him as impersonal, and ascribes this to the fact that his individual character is merged in that of his age and people. But in truth he somewhat exaggerates the impersonality which he explains so ingeniously. Sophocles is in reality a very personal and living character.

‘Euripides is human, but Sophocles is more human. He is so in the only way in which a Greek could be so, by being more Greek. . . . True simplicity is not the avoidance but the control of detail. In Sophocles, as in great sculpture, a thousand fine touches go to the delineation of the great primary emotions. Sophocles is the purest type of the Greek intellect at its best. Euripides is a very different thing—a highly gifted son of his day.’

That is the final word. So Sir Richard Jebb wrote more than a quarter of a century ago. What he then wrote he has demonstrated point by point in this great edition which he has just completed.

And another leading English scholar, whose study has been hardly less intimate and profound, says, and says well, the same thing, when he combats the view of those who pass Sophocles by with a disappointed feeling that what is so smooth and finished cannot be otherwise than cold. To study Sophocles, writes Professor Campbell, is like studying his statue in the Lateran Museum. ‘The first glance may show us only a statesman or general of handsome presence but moderate calibre, but as we continue gazing on the harmonious figure, a grave and sympathetic humanity is seen to breathe from every line.’

High, then, as Sophocles stood before, this edition lifts him higher still, not so much as against Æschylus or Euripides—for in raising Sophocles Professor Jebb raises the whole Greek drama with him—but absolutely, as one of the most consummate artists of all time, as a joy and a standard of joy for ever. What, after all, does Greek tragedy teach us? That to attain the highest success in poetry a man must be himself, and his best self; for, as a Greek critic says, he who would be a good poet must first be a good man; he must have simplicity and naturalness, faith, optimism, idealism. 'Chez les Grecs l'idéal passait dans la vie, parce qu'ils savaient tout simplifier, même le bonheur.' And idealism has at least this advantage, that it gets more out of human nature, rouses it to greater effort, than realism. Modern taste is sometimes drawn to Euripides because it finds in him its own pleasant vices, and finds them in a glorious form. But the real secret and the real success of Greek tragedy is to be found in Sophocles.

If, then, the world were ever to give up Greek as a part of the general culture of its most cultivated minds, the greatest treasure it would lose is Sophocles, and for this reason. He is the least translatable, the least imitable, the most Greek of the Greeks. The romance of Homer, the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, the great thoughts of Plato and Aristotle, would survive and affect mankind, as indeed they have ere now done, even at second-hand. Some equivalent to the effect of Æschylus might be found in the book of Job or the Hebrew prophets; something of the fun of Aristophanes, of the sweetness of Theocritus, might still be reproduced and preserved. The realism, the neurotic sentimentalism, the emphasis, the rhetoric, which mingle with the dazzling allurements of Euripides—these are elements less necessary to the modern world, which possesses enough of them already. But the sage sanity, the sculpturesque serenity of Sophocles, the just blending of philosophy and passion, thought and expression, wedded like soul and body in a form of breathing, sentient, mobile beauty—this only Sophocles can give, and only Sophocles in his own incomparable tongue.

T. HERBERT WARREN.

Art. II.—THE RELIGION OF NAPOLEON I.

1. *Correspondance de Napoléon I^{er}*. Paris, 1857, *et seq.*
2. *Lettres inédites de Napoléon I^{er}*. Published by Léon Lecestre. Two vols. Paris: Plon, 1897.
3. *Sainte-Hélène: Journal inédit de 1815 à 1818*. Par le Général Baron Gourgaud. Third edition. Paris: Flammarion. *n.d.*
4. *Recueil de Pièces authentiques sur Sainte-Hélène*. Par le Général Comte de Montholon. Bruxelles, 1821, *et seq.*
5. *Souvenirs de Sainte-Hélène*. Par la Comtesse de Montholon. Paris: Émile Paul, 1901.
6. *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*. Par le Chevalier de Beauterne. Paris, 1840.
7. *Notes and Reminiscences of a Staff Officer*. By Lieut.-Col. Basil Jackson. Edited by R. C. Seaton. London: Murray, 1903.

THE religious beliefs of a great man are always of the highest interest. While his general conduct and his actions in the varying crises of life tell us much of his character, they do not reveal the whole of it. They show us all the externals of the man; but just as we remain in ignorance of his nature, even of his face, until we have looked well into his eyes, and watched how they caress a friend, or twinkle with laughter, or flash with anger, so, too, his inner being lies hidden from view until its outlook on the external is disclosed in some mood of genuine self-revelation, or amidst a disaster that strips the soul bare of everyday garniture. Such times of self-disclosure come often upon emotional and poetic natures; and the world's literature could ill spare their outcome. Other beings soar easily on the wings of ecstasy, and hold the divine to be the one reality in a world of fleeting shadows. In others, again,

‘The soul grows clotted by contagion,
Imbodies and imbrutes, till she quite lose
The divine property of her first being.’

With the great mass of mankind, immersed in material facts, introspection is rare, and self-revelation is rarer. Even if the religious nature escapes the debasement denounced by our great Puritan poet, it loses the power

of clear articulation, and gives forth but uncertain sounds. Hence it is often a matter of great difficulty to ascribe any definite religious beliefs to many of the world's greatest men of action. We know little or nothing of the inmost convictions of Hannibal, Cæsar, and Charlemagne; the two prominent religious acts of Alexander the Great that have been recorded were certainly prompted by political motives; and the notorious fact that a state creed was looked on by a long line of Roman emperors, both pagan and Christian, as an impalpable but highly effective police force, inspired Gibbon with one of his most telling invectives against Christianity. Indeed, many of the most active rulers—Alfred the Great is a splendid exception—have not thought much about religion; they have used it. Their thought on this momentous subject has generally been in inverse ratio to the extent of their use of it as a mundane instrument. We propose in the present article to examine the religious belief of Napoleon Bonaparte; and the thinness and vagueness of much of the evidence must be excused by the general considerations set forth above; though, on the other hand, the uncertainty which has until lately rested over this side of his life is the best justification for undertaking this inquiry in the case of so important and fascinating a personality.

In the case of a character so thickset and tenacious as that of Napoleon I, which more and more worked back into the groove of the primal instincts and family traditions, we naturally begin by asking what were the instincts that moulded his life in the early, or Corsican, part of his career. As is well known, he came of a family which, on both sides, was of patrician rank, and he had some claim to official nobility in the paternal line. True, his father himself was not an orthodox Roman Catholic, but professed at ordinary times the Voltairean views that were then in vogue, and even wrote epigrams against the Church and its creed. The young Napoleon, however, positively disliked his father because he espoused the French cause in the strife between France and Paoli. The lad eagerly took the nationalist side, and during his earliest years mixed freely with the peasants and fishermen who formed the bulk of Paoli's following. These people were devoted Romanists; and the young Bona-

partes, when they began to espouse the cause of the French Revolution, soon found out the strength of the religious instinct which was now to be ranged against them in their native island. On one occasion, in the autumn of 1790, Napoleon and his elder brother Joseph were in danger of their lives because they showed scant respect to a procession of priests and devotees who were appealing to the citizens of Ajaccio against the new anti-clerical decrees of the French National Assembly. The two young democrats barely escaped condign chastisement; and Napoleon, if not Joseph, seems always to have retained a vivid impression of the power of the orthodox creed over the Latin peoples.

Still more lasting were the impressions that he gained from his mother's training. He resembled her far more than his father; and for her 'superhuman fortitude' (the phrase is his own) he ever retained the profoundest respect. Her nature was of the primitive Corsican type, developed in the hard and penurious life of the gentry in the mountainous interior, where tradition and family honour made up the moral code; and she bequeathed her sternly practical qualities to her famous son, along with an innate respect for the religion of his race. As to the value of his mother's training he bore frequent testimony. At St Helena he remarked to the Countess Montholon: 'The first principles that one receives from one's parents, and that one takes in along with mother's milk, leave an ineffaceable imprint.' The words, as will presently appear, have a practical bearing on the final stages of our inquiry. Meanwhile, we note that from his parents he inherited very diverse tendencies. His father bequeathed to him the speculative faculties that enabled him to wander at ease among systems of philosophy, and to frame grandiose political schemes; while from his mother he had that strongly practical bent which ever drove him to look closely at facts, and to assess them at their inmost value in relation to the needs of life. The instincts implanted by her training were never lost. Méneval, in his 'Souvenirs' (iii, 114), relates that Napoleon, when emperor, frequently made the sign of the cross, quite involuntarily, at the news of any great danger or deliverance.

But the laws of heredity, which explain so much in the life of an ordinary man, never unravel the inner

mysteries of the life of a genius. So original a being as Napoleon early outleaped all the possibilities that seemed to await the son of the dilettante Corsican lawyer, and of his uninformed spouse. The whirlwind of the French Revolution caught him away from insular hopes and ambitions—he had hoped to free Corsica from the French—and opened up the career that was to astonish mankind. It would be an error to say that it rooted up his religious faith, for there is very slight proof as to religion having had any vital hold on him, even in his earlier years. Sent to the military school of Brienne at the age of ten, he led an unhappy, moody existence there under the superintendence of monks whom he detested; and his life at the *École Militaire* in Paris (1784–85) was no more conducive to the growth of faith than his sojourn at Brienne. In later years he is said to have remarked that the happiest day of his life was that of his first communion, which he received on his birthday during this sojourn at Paris. The pleasing effect which the sound of village bells always had upon him has also been referred to the happy associations which they conjured up. However that may be, the fact is certain that his letters written at Brienne reveal no religious sentiment. The most noteworthy expression is that in which he thanks God, '*le grand moteur des choses humaines*,' for having fitted him for the finest of all careers, that of a soldier. Equally noteworthy is his later reference to his sturdy defence of his own little harbour against the assaults of his school-fellows on the festival of St Louis: 'Yes, I had the instinct that my will was to prevail over that of others, and that what pleased me must belong to me.'*

This unyielding egotism, which embittered his school-life, gained new strength from a study of Rousseau, whose geometrical designs for the creation of a perfect polity appealed to the methodising instincts of the young officer and drew him for many years far away from Christianity. During his sojourn at Valence and Auxonne we find him eagerly studying history to buttress his favourite theories; and in his voluminous note-books written at that time (1785–87) we find the manuscript of his first controversial work. In it he made a fierce onslaught

* Chuquet, '*La Jeunesse de Napoléon*' (Brienne), p. 124.

on a Protestant pastor of Geneva who had successfully criticised the statement at the close of Rousseau's 'Social Contract,' that Christianity broke up the harmony and order of civil society, and enjoined servitude. Bonaparte took up the cudgels on behalf of his then favourite author, affirming that the Christian creed was hostile to a perfect polity; for, by bidding men look forward to another life, it rendered them too submissive to the evils of the present. Nor would he allow any merit to Protestantism; for, he maintained, by encouraging individual liberty of thought it broke up the unity of society, and was the fertile source of schisms and civil wars. The essay is remarkable for vehemence of expression, which consorted somewhat ill with the rigidly mechanical views of life that the author advocated. In his view civil government should aim at securing a general uniformity of life, both in the spheres of moral and material well-being. It must 'lend assistance to the feeble against the strong, and by this means allow every one to enjoy a sweet tranquillity, the road of happiness.' In brief, he declared himself for the perfecting of society by external means alone. Human welfare could be attained by the State, the aid of religion being superfluous, if not actually harmful. Such was his creed at the age of eighteen, and such it was long to remain. This explains his friendship with the younger Robespierre, and his admiration for the Terrorist chief. Their political and ethical creeds were practically identical.

The downfall of the Robespierres and the strange vicissitudes of his own career shook his faith in the efficacy of this levelling creed, and left him for a time weary and disenchanted. 'Life is but a light dream, which soon vanishes'—so he wrote to his brother Joseph on June 24, 1795; and again he remarked that soon he would not move aside to avoid a carriage. The luxury and dissipation of Paris aroused in him a contempt for his kind that he was never wholly to lose. The death of two enthusiasms—the first, that on behalf of Corsica; the second, that which aimed at the ideals of Lycurgus—left him morally rudderless; and an incident in the first part of his warfare on the Italian frontier shows him to have already thrown all scruples to the winds. While walking one day along the French positions at the Col di Tenda with his mistress, the wife of one of the French

commissioners, he bethought him that she would like to see an engagement. He therefore ordered an attack, which he thus described to Las Cases at St Helena :

'We won, it is true, but the fight could, of course, end in nothing. It was a pure fancy on my part; but, for all that, some few men were left on the ground. Whenever I have since thought of that I have always reproached myself for my conduct.'*

After this admission it is needless to inquire whether religious principles had any sway over him in the years of disillusionment that followed on the collapse of his political ideals.

His invasion of Italy in 1796-97 brought him into close contact with the Papacy; and his observation of the real power which religion exerted in the Peninsula seems to have reawakened his respect for the creed of his childhood. At any rate, though he was ordered by the Directory, then dominant at Paris, to uproot the Pope's authority, he constantly evaded the task. Indeed, he urged very different conduct on the French envoy at the Eternal City. Thus, on October 28, 1796, he wrote :

'I covet the title of saviour, far more than that of destroyer of the Holy See. You are yourself aware that we have always held the same principles in this matter; and if they will only be wise at Rome, we will take advantage of the unlimited power conferred on me by the Directory to give peace to this fair portion of the world, and quiet the alarmed consciences of many nations.'

Unfortunately, the effect of this letter, which might have come from a veritable *dévo*t, is marred by one written four days' earlier to the same envoy, in which Bonaparte told him that the great thing was to gain time, so that, when the French were ready to invade the Papal States in force, they might secure the important seaport of Ancona. 'In short, the finesse of the game is for us to throw the ball from one to the other, so as to amuse the old fox.' The young conqueror was, however, careful to give the impression that the Roman Church would gain far better terms from him than from the Directory; but his friendship was bought somewhat dearly at the price

* Las Cases, 'Mémorial de Ste-Hélène,' vol. i, p. 180.

of a heavy ransom and one hundred works of art, to be selected at Rome, to adorn the museums of Paris.

Amidst all these opportunist devices we catch glimpses of his respect for the Church as a great governing power. He discovered this power even in the first of the self-governing republics which he erected in the north of Italy; he complained that, during his absence, the elections had gone almost wholly for the clerical party, and that, too, in districts which had of late cast off the rule of the Pope's legates. He therefore held the balance level in religious matters, curbing the clericals, but repressing the silly excesses of which the Italian Jacobins were guilty against the Church.* Now that he was charged with the administration of large areas in Italy, he sought to bring over the bishops to his side; and the following letter to the Bishop of Como (May 6, 1797) shows his complete emancipation from the anti-Christian fervour of his youth.

'Never throw oil, but throw water, on the passions of men; scatter prejudices, and firmly strive against the false priests who have degraded religion by making it the tool of the ambition of the powerful and of kings. The morality of the Gospel is that of equality, and henceforth it is most favourable to the republican government which is now to be that of your country.' ('Correspondence,' No. 1770.)

And when the Archbishop of Genoa had recommended submission to the new French and democratic constitution, he received this glowing eulogy (Sept. 10, 1797):

'I have just received, citizen, your pastoral of September 5. I thought I heard one of the twelve apostles speak. It is thus that St Paul spoke. How religion inspires esteem when she has ministers like you! True apostle of the Gospel, you inspire respect; you oblige your enemies to esteem and admire you; you even convert the unbeliever.' (Ib. No. 2182.)

In less than a year Bonaparte was proclaiming (July 2, 1798) to the people of Egypt that the French had come as

* At Milan, in the spring of 1796, the statue of St Ambrose had been cast down and dragged through the streets. Profane literature deluged the Lombard cities for a time. Some of the churches were turned into Jacobin clubs, and a patriotic liturgy and *Credo* were recited. The last began: 'I believe in the French Republic, and in its son, General Bonaparte.' These excesses soon led to the inevitable reaction.

their friends and allies; that they had overthrown the Pope, who said men ought to make war on the Moslems; and had destroyed the Knights of Malta

'because those madmen believed that God desired war with the Moslems. Have we not for centuries been the friends of the Grand Signor (may God accomplish his desires) and the enemy of his enemies?' ('Correspondence,' No. 2723.)

It is needless to follow Bonaparte through the marvelously clever shifts adopted for the purpose of cajoling the Moslems in Egypt and the Christians of the Lebanon in turn. It is of interest to remember that this last effort, during the siege of Acre, was partly foiled by Sir Sidney Smith distributing among those Christians copies of Bonaparte's Moslem proclamations to the Egyptians.

The Egyptian expedition was little more than a dramatic interlude in Bonaparte's career, designed to fill an interval until the Directory should collapse from internal weakness, and from the difficulties in which its rashness had involved it. On his return to France he found that 'the pear was ripe'; and prominent among the causes that made for change was the nagging anti-clerical policy of the government. As soon as the popular general had overthrown the Directory he sought to base his power as First Consul on a general pacification. The brave Vendéan peasants were coaxed to surrender largely through the instrumentality of a democratic priest, Bernier; and the same man was entrusted with the overtures for a reconciliation with the Papacy, the temporal power of which had been restored by the second coalition. Into the complex negotiations that finally led to the signing of the Concordat of 1801-02 it is, of course, impossible to enter; but the reasons with which Napoleon justified, in the face of France and the world, this most momentous change in republican policy are very noteworthy. With characteristic boldness he defied the infidel sentiments of his army and of France in an allocution to the clergy of Milan, just nine days before the battle of Marengo established his power. After remarking that philosophers had striven to persuade France that Catholicism must always be hostile to liberty, and that this was the cause of the cruel and

foolish persecution of religion during the Revolution, he continued :

'Experience has undeceived the French, and has convinced them that the Catholic religion is better adapted than any other to diverse forms of government, and is particularly favourable to republican institutions. I myself am a philosopher, and I know that, in every society whatsoever, no man is considered just and virtuous who does not know whence he came and whither he is going. Simple reason cannot guide you in this matter; without religion one walks continually in darkness; and the Catholic religion alone gives to man certain and infallible information concerning his origin and his latter end.'

The identification of virtue with exact knowledge of a very metaphysical problem is here asserted with a boldness which would have startled the Socrates of the Dialogues of Plato. But there is no need to take the statement as more than a rhetorical platitude which would please the classical scholars there present. The argument that a man ought to seek to know whence he comes, what he is, and whither he is going, was frequently on Bonaparte's lips, and often served him in defence of religion. There is, indeed, every reason to think that the Socratic maxim, 'Know thyself,' genuinely interested him. In fact, this intensely practical man, as he once described himself, longed for certainty in all things. During the course of his life he came more and more to dislike change, whether in matters social, political, or purely personal. He carried this last foible so far as to keep the same people about him, presumably because the coming of new persons gave him the trouble of fathoming their natures and finding out what their inmost feelings towards him really were. Speculative in his youth, in obedience to the paternal strain in his nature, he ransacked systems and creeds in the craving for fixity of belief, which we may trace to the tough fibre of his mother's kin. Rousseau's dogmatism satisfied him for a time; but his contact with the primitive society of the East shattered his belief in the perfect polity set forth as attainable in the 'Social Contract.' That creed had long been on the wane; and he subsequently avowed that it was the sight of savage man as he really was which finally cured him

of Rousseauism. 'Savage man is a dog,' he exclaimed with his usual incisive curttness.

That belief having gone, he had to choose, as virtual ruler of France, between Catholicism, Protestantism, the Theophilanthropy of La Réveillière-Lépeaux, and mere irreligion. The various creeds are said by Thibaudeau to have claimed the following totals of adherents in France: Catholics, 15,000,000; Protestants, Jews, and Theophilanthropists, 3,000,000; while 17,000,000 were reckoned as infidels. The last total is probably too high; but it was clearly open to Bonaparte to continue the irreligious régime of the Directory. He declined, however, for reasons that will now appear. The Theophilanthropists numbered about a million; their creed, a quaint mixture of the worship of Reason with an ethical cult and liturgy devised by the fallen Director, was already on the wane; and Bonaparte dealt it a death-blow by refusing to its votaries the use of any churches, on the ground that it was not a religion at all.

'What is your Theophilanthropy?' he said to one of them. 'Oh, don't talk to me of a religion which only takes me for this life without telling me whence I come or whither I go.'

This argument in favour of religious dogma acquires added interest from the fact that the young Comte was then beginning his education at Paris, and must have heard of the expiring efforts of the Theophilanthropists to hold their ground against the religious positivism of Bonaparte.

The Protestant creed never had any charms for him. He is reported to have expressed his regret, at a later time, that he did not make France Protestant, but the expression can have been nothing more than an outburst of spleen against the unyielding attitude of the Roman Church towards his claim of absolute supremacy. There is nothing in his writings, early or late, to show that he ever had the slightest regard for the Protestant principle of the right of private judgment, which ran counter to all his ideas of the solidarity of the State. His boyish tirade against the pastor of Geneva represents his attitude all through his life. At St Helena he told General and Madame de Montholon, with convincing *naïveté*, why he had not chosen to make France Protestant in 1800. If

he threw in his lot with the Church of Rome there was a good chance of his having a solid and obedient nation at his back. If he declared for Protestantism, there would at once have been two or more great parties.

'These parties, by tearing one another to pieces, would have annihilated France, and would have made her the slave of Europe, when my ambition was to make her mistress of Europe. With the aid of Catholicism I should more easily attain all my great results. Abroad, Catholicism would keep the Pope on my side; and with my influence, and our forces in Italy, I did not despair of having, sooner or later, by one means or another, the direction of this Pope. And thenceforth, what an influence! What a lever of opinion for the rest of the world! Never in all my quarrels with the Pope have I touched a dogma.'*

Nowhere else did Napoleon ever state so simply and baldly the reasons for his rejecting Protestantism and founding his rule on Catholicism. True, he added that he naturally clung to the faith of his childhood; but it is no outrageous cynicism to hold that the political reasoning stated above prevailed over sentimental motives. After the brilliant triumphs of 1796, he based his behaviour on the lines laid down in his famous letter of October 7, 1797, to Talleyrand:

'It is only with prudence, wisdom, and great dexterity that obstacles are surmounted and important ends attained. If we take as the basis for all operations true policy, which is nothing else than the calculation of combinations and chances, we shall long remain *la grande nation*, the arbiter of Europe.'

There spake the greatest player of political chess that the world has ever seen, for whom the world was the board, and monarchs and nations merely pieces in the game. With his usual proneness to material measurement, he even assessed the Pope's influence by military standards. 'Treat with the Pope,' he wrote to the French minister at Rome, 'as if he had 200,000 men.'

Why then did Napoleon quarrel with the Pope in and after the year 1809? Why did he condone his arrest and

* 'Souvenirs de Ste-Hélène,' Appendix II. This appendix consists of notes, previously unpublished, made by Montholon for his 'Récits de la Captivité de Napoléon.' They are taken from a *cahier* in the possession of the Vicomte de Couëdic.

deportation from Rome? The story is a long one. He always gave out that those acts were due to a mistake of General Miollis; but, he added, 'what is done is done'; and, on the whole, Pius VII had better go to Savona. It would seem, however, that he had long resolved to wield the temporal power himself. In August 1806 he had written that Italy must be his, and the Pope his vassal. In July 1807 Pius VII was to be reminded of Christ's words, that His kingdom was not of this world. Why then did the successor of Peter set himself above Christ? Finally, when the Pope was a prisoner, he stated that the temporal power was gone for ever. In fact he judged that he no longer needed the support of the Papacy. When the papal nuncio read out to him the bull of excommunication after the battle of Essling, he said courteously: 'You have done your duty; you are a very brave man; I esteem you.' Then, on re-reading the document, he said: 'What can the Pope do? I have 300,000 men under my orders. With his lightning can he make the arms fall from my soldiers' hands?'

His sense of the value of papal support therefore rested ultimately on a material basis. Not until his power was tottering to its fall, early in 1814, did he think of restoring the Pope to liberty and sending him to Rome. 'Let him burst on that place,' he said, 'like a bomb-shell.*' It is not surprising that devout historians should see in this unworthy treatment of a delicate old man a chief cause of the Emperor's fall, just as they point to the miseries of the retreat from Moscow as proof of the efficacy of the papal thunderbolts.†

His attitude towards religion, then, was at bottom determined by political considerations. True, he attended mass on suitable occasions, and preserved there an outward decorum which contrasted well with the levity that disgraced the Court of France, even in the time of Louis XVI; but it was a political function, in which he did honour to his 'sacred *gendarmérie*.' If the clergy opposed him, he at once curbed their prerogatives, dismissing refractory bishops and priests, and even forbidding the publication of 'any work on ecclesiastical affairs.'‡

* 'New Letters,' January 21, 1814.

† De Beauterne, cap. iv.

‡ 'New Letters,' July 19, 1811. A large number of these letters excluded from the 'official' correspondence, deal with church affairs.

But if this methodising genius fenced in the Church, much more severely did he gag her opponents. Protestants were attached to the State by a well-devised system, but infidels were promptly silenced. Eleven days after the mighty blow of Austerlitz consolidated Napoleon's power, he sent a missive from the palace of Schönbrunn, sharply rebuking a M. Lalande, who had ventured to air very heterodox opinions in the august circle of the Institute of France. Affecting to pity this once learned man, who had evidently fallen into dotage, and now spoke only in order to be talked about, the Emperor declared that he disgraced both himself and that learned body by professing atheism—'a principle destructive of all social organisation in that it takes from man all his consolations and hopes.' The Institute must therefore officially warn the offender never again to publish anything of such a nature as to overcloud the memory of his earlier services. If those fraternal admonitions failed, it would be the Emperor's duty to prevent the destruction of the morality of his people, 'for atheism destroys all morality, if not in individuals, yet assuredly in nations.' His inmost feelings on this subject were stated to Roederer, not long after Brumaire, with the frankness that he often showed towards that clever man and agreeable talker.

'How can morality exist?' said he. 'There is only one means—that of re-establishing religion. . . . Society cannot exist without inequality of fortunes, and inequality of fortunes cannot exist without religion. When one man is dying of hunger near another who suffers from surfeit, he cannot resign himself to this difference unless there is an authority that can say to him, "God wills it so; there must be rich and poor in this world; but hereafter, and for ever, their lot will be different."'

The crude materialism of this argument, coinciding as it does with so many other characteristics of Napoleon's policy in the days of his power, absolves us from the task of further inquiry as to the wholeheartedness of his devotion either to the dogmas of Rome or to the teachings of Christ. But the passionate assertions of many devout souls, that in his days of misfortune at

* Roederer, 'Œuvres,' iii, 335.

St Helena he became a convinced believer, call for a careful investigation. The stories on this topic have certainly a great charm and some traits of verisimilitude. The most famous of them is that in which Napoleon is described as pouring forth a 'torrent of eloquence' (to use Lacordaire's epithet) on the subject of the enduring majesty of Christ's kingdom, as contrasted with the passing pomp of merely human conquerors. The first version of this incident is worth quoting, if only because it inspired Lacordaire, Newman,* and finally, Canon Liddon, with some of their noblest periods. After long arguments against paganism, and the systems of Lycurgus and Confucius, the Emperor is reported as saying:

'It is not the same with Christ. Everything in him astonishes me: his spirit soars above mine, and his will confounds me. Between him and every other person in the world no comparison is possible. He is truly a being apart from all. His ideas and his sentiments, the truth that he announces, his manner of convincing one, are not to be explained either by human organisation or by the nature of things. His birth and the history of his life, the profundity of his dogma, which touches the height of all difficulties and yet is their most admirable solution, his Gospel, the singularity of this mysterious being, his apparition, his empire, his march across centuries and realms—all is to me a prodigy, an unfathomable mystery that plunges me in a reverie from which I cannot escape, a mystery that is under my eyes and endures, which I can neither deny nor explain. I see nothing of the human in this. . . . Nations perish; thrones fall; the Church alone endures. . . . I have inspired multitudes of men who died for me. Certainly I possess the secret of this magical power which exalts the spirit, but I could not communicate it to any one; not one of my generals has received or divined it from me; no more have I the secret of immortalising my name and the love of me in men's hearts, and of working miracles without the help of matter. Now that I am nailed to this rock, who fights and conquers empires for me? . . . Where are my friends? Yes, there are two or three of you, immortalised by your faithfulness; you share and console my exile. . . . Such is the destiny of great men. Murdered by the English oligarchy, I am dying before my time, and my corpse will be given back to the earth to become

* Cardinal Newman, 'Sermons Preached on Various Occasions' (1858), p. 57.

food for worms. What an abyss of distance between my misery and the eternal reign of Christ—preached, incensed, loved, adored, living through all the world. Is that death? Is it not rather life? Such is the death of Christ. It is that of God.' (De Beauterne, cap. v.)

Let us examine the evidence as to the authenticity of this remarkable monologue. It occurs in a little work published in 1840 by the Chevalier de Beauterne, entitled, 'Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme.' A second edition with additions and alterations was brought out in 1864 by M. Bouniol, who states that the former editor had gained most of his information from Count Montholon. De Beauterne himself had regretfully admitted that he received little or no help from the other companions of Napoleon's exile. From Las Cases he had received 'a singular letter which is not calculated to give a great idea of his penetration, if it honours his conscientiousness': but he consoled himself with the thought that Las Cases was so short a time at St Helena that he can have had only a superficial knowledge of his master. General Bertrand also had been uncommunicative; Gourgaud had promised some 'precious documents' on the subject of his master's religion, but did not send them. From a M. Olivier, de Beauterne had a long account of a conversation with Cardinal Fesch, Napoleon's uncle, in which Fesch asserted that the whole of the Emperor's life had been religious, a fact which was apparent in all his works; that he had been tempted by an emissary of Pitt in 1802 with the prospect of a splendid peace with England if he would make France Protestant; and that the Czar had held out the same prospects on the raft at Tilsit if he (Napoleon) would embrace the Greek faith. These and other silly stories at the beginning of the book give us a poor idea of de Beauterne's critical powers. After other historical and biographical details of the same stamp, we come to the famous monologue from which extracts are given above. It covers no less than thirty-three closely printed pages, and is cited as having been spoken at one time. M. Bouniol, however, assures us that it represents thoughts uttered on several occasions to Napoleon's interlocutors. The presence of these is nowhere visible except in this final touch:

'The Emperor became silent, and, as General Bertrand remained equally still, he resumed: "If you do not understand that Jesus Christ is God, well—I was wrong in making you a general."'

This finale has the true Napoleonic ring; but the monologue as a whole, though it contains powerful and original passages, does not strike the careful student of Napoleon's acts and sayings as representing his inmost thoughts on religion. The long period (too long for quotation) in which he is made to inveigh against Mohammed as an impostor, and as author of a creed that panders to man's evil passions, is in flagrant contradiction to the many passages, quoted by more credible authorities, in which he spoke with admiration of the prophet of the East, and of his faith as 'simpler and more adapted to their morality than ours.'* Other statements, which represent him as citing the mystery of religion as proof of its divinity, flatly oppose everything that we know of his longing for the tangible and the demonstrable. 'In literature,' says the Comtesse de Montholon, 'he liked simplicity, the true and *naïf* description of feelings.' The same was true of his taste in matters philosophical. Voltaire was his favourite writer—a choice which harmonises ill with the ecstasy of devotion that de Beauterne attributes to him.

This monologue, then, must be pronounced suspect on internal grounds. The external evidence in its favour is also very weak. De Beauterne's book appeared in 1840, the very time when Montholon, its presumed compiler, was working hard for Louis Napoleon, whose chief of staff he became in the futile attempt at Boulogne. The false and venomous reference to England at its close, and the effort everywhere apparent, to glorify the Roman Church, render it suspiciously like one of the many pamphlets that were put forth to aid the Pretender's cause. Montholon, it is true, was incapable of writing that religious dissertation, which, viewed in the abstract, is so admirable in many ways. It is probable that he had clerical help in working up some of his St Helena notes; and the result took the form of the eloquent manifesto.

* Gourgaud, 'Journal,' i. 454; ii. 77, 272; Las Cases, 'Mémorial,' iv. 124.

which, through the medium of Lacordaire and John Henry Newman, has gained world-wide repute.

We now have before us some of Montholon's notes in their first form. The most remarkable passage on the subject of religion is the following report of Napoleon's remarks in conversation one evening—date not specified:

"Everything proclaims the existence of God: it cannot be doubted. As soon as I had power I made haste to restore religion. I made use of it as the basis and root; it was in my eyes the support of morality, true principles, and good manners. The restlessness of man is such that he must have this vague and mysterious element that religion presents to him." Some one having remarked that he [Napoleon] might finally become a devout man, the Emperor replied that he feared not, but that with him unbelief sprang neither from caprice nor from an unbridled spirit. "Man," he added, "ought to asseverate about nothing, especially about what concerns his last moments. . . . To say whence I come, what I am, whither I am going, is beyond my thoughts, and yet the thing exists. I am the watch which exists and does not know itself. The religious sentiment is so consoling that it is a heavenly boon to possess it."*

And on another occasion he said:

'One believes in God because everything around us proclaims him, and the greatest minds have believed in him—not only Bossuet, but Newton and Leibnitz. Such, literally, has been the case with me in the progress of my mind. I felt the need of belief, and I believed. But my belief was uncertain after I reasoned. Perhaps I shall believe blindly once again. God grant it. I do not offer resistance—assuredly not; I do not ask for anything better. . . . I have never doubted about God.'†

If we are to trust Gourgaud's 'Journal,' Napoleon's theism was very often clouded with doubts; and every external circumstance invests Gourgaud's notes with a higher credibility than pertains to those of Montholon. For, in the first place, he was a far more truthful man than Montholon; indeed, he was the only one of Napoleon's four companions whose word, if uncorroborated, counts

* Comtesse de Montholon's 'Souvenirs,' Appendix I.

† Ibid. Appendix II.

for much. Secondly, he noted down Napoleon's conversations day by day, following them through their varying moods with Boswellian fidelity, and adding occasionally his own remarks and criticisms in a way that shows his own *naïveté* and the lack of the set Bonapartist design which mars the works of Las Cases and Montholon. And yet Gourgaud is not wholly to be trusted on some topics, probably including that of religion. His frankness and his whimsical moods often annoyed the Emperor, who took his revenge by nagging at him, and finally seems to have worked so as to drive him from the island. Now Gourgaud was a *dévot*, perhaps he was even an orthodox Catholic; and one of the Emperor's ways of teasing him was to wound his religious feelings. This, we think, explains the frequency with which this topic recurs in Gourgaud's 'Journal.' Once the Emperor scandalised his faithful squire by reading the Bible with a map, and declaring that he intended to write a history of the campaigns of Moses. Frequently he vaunted the superiority of Mohammedanism over Christianity; it was simpler: 'God is great and Mohammed is his prophet,' was its fundamental creed. Moreover, the *imams* in Egypt had often worsted him by declaring that Christians believed in three gods, and were therefore pagans. Then again, Mohammed conquered half the world in ten years, a feat which cost Christianity three centuries of struggle.* Sometimes he went the length of declaring that all religions were the work of man, and on some dozen occasions he professed a thorough-going materialism, alleging that Monge, Berthollet, and Laplace held materialistic views.

'I believe that man has been produced by the clay warmed by the sun, and combined with electric fluids. What are animals, an ox, for example, if not organic matter? . . . Nevertheless, the idea of God is the simplest. Who has made all that? . . . Do soldiers believe in God? They see the dead fall so fast around them.'

Montholon then suggested that they should have a chaplain to amuse them. Gourgaud protested against the profanity of the motive urged; and Napoleon cut short

* Gourgaud, 'Journal,' i, 454; ii, 78, 272, etc.

the discussion by saying that he had other things to think about.* It is interesting to compare this with the calumny which de Beauterne gave to the world in 1840, that the British government withheld a priest from them until the Pope intervened.

With regard to the divinity of Christ, not a word was said by Napoleon to Gourgaud showing that he held that central belief. Of the seven entries in Gourgaud's 'Journal' on this theme, at least three represent Napoleon as altogether an unbeliever. Twice he expressed a doubt whether Jesus ever existed; and on all occasions he spoke of Him in much the same terms that he applied to Mohammed or Plato. True, Gourgaud was at St Helena for only half the period of Napoleon's exile; but during the twenty-eight months of his stay he saw his master constantly and reported his words minutely. It seems impossible, then, to set aside his testimony on the ground that Napoleon often teased him on religious subjects.† Variable on many subjects, the Napoleon of Gourgaud showed no appreciable variation with regard to the divinity of Christ. If, then, the Emperor used the famous words reported by de Beauterne—'Je connais les hommes, et je vous dis que Jésus Christ n'est pas homme'—his opinions underwent a complete change in the last years.

Are there grounds for believing that such a change came over him as he once said he would welcome? The evidence on this subject is obscure. Montholon and Bertrand were then almost openly irreligious; the Countess de Montholon left for Europe in July 1819; and the Countess Bertrand, who remained, was disliked by the Emperor. Two priests, Buonavita and Vignali, arrived in September 1819; the former of these returned almost at once; Vignali, though far from being the ignorant man he has often been described (for he had studied medicine and philosophy at Rome, and had recently taken the degrees of Ph.D. and M.D.), never won the great man's confidence. Moreover, he was assassinated not long after his return to Corsica in 1821. There is therefore little left but the gossip of physicians, valets, or the

* Gourgaud, 'Journal,' I, p. 440.

† Before Gourgaud left the island he was some weeks with Captain Basil Jackson, who, in his work 'Waterloo and St Helena,' set forth Gourgaud's conviction that Napoleon was a materialist.

commissioners of the Powers, the later lucubrations of Montholon, the evidence supplied by Napoleon's will, and the directions which he left for his son. Some doubt even rests on the question whether extreme unction was administered to the dying man. Montholon, on his return to Europe, affirmed this to Lord Holland, but declared that Vignali had orders to say that it was administered solely on his (Montholon's) responsibility.* Vignali was certainly left alone with the sufferer, and doubtless performed the solemn rite; but why so much mystery should have been thrown around the matter it is hard to say; except on the supposition that, even in his dying hours, Napoleon wished to fence with the judgment of posterity.

Scarcely more convincing are the references to religious and ethical subjects in his will, and in the political testament intended for the Duc de Reichstadt. To his son he bequeathed none of those fervent injunctions as to the forgiveness of enemies which Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette in their last hours impressed on the hapless dauphin. Napoleon merely warned his son that religion had a power far greater than certain narrow-minded philosophers would allow, and that it was 'capable of rendering great services to humanity. By standing well with the Pope, an influence can be maintained over the consciences of a hundred million people.'† One would have expected something more inspiring than this from the hand of a convinced Christian when giving his last advice to his only child.

The third clause of Napoleon's will is certainly remarkable for the pardon which it proclaimed towards one who had deeply wronged him.

'I have always had reason to be well pleased with my very dear wife, Marie Louise. I preserve towards her to my last moments the most tender sentiments; I pray her to take heed so as to keep my son from the snares which still surround his infancy.'

Seeing that he knew her to have long been living in adultery with 'ce polisson de Neipperg,' the passage is

* Lord Holland's 'Foreign Reminiscences,' p. 316.

† Montholon, 'Captivité de Napoléon,' vol. iii, ch. 6.

remarkable; but he always maintained that she 'was innocence itself,' and that circumstances had been too much for her.* His conduct towards her, as earlier towards Josephine, shows him to have been forgiving and indulgent towards a crime which must have wounded every instinct of personal and family honour, specially strong in a Corsican. The will also testifies to his generosity of heart towards those who had helped and befriended him in his early days, as in his exile. But its references to political opponents are of a very different order. Reverting to his execution of the Duc d'Enghien, he defends it as needful for the safety, interest, and honour of the French people, and declares that in similar circumstances he would repeat the action. Efforts have been made to explain away this clause as the result of a sudden access of irritation. But it exactly coincides with his opinion on this affair expressed to Admiral Cockburn on the voyage to St Helena,† and must therefore be considered, not as the outburst of an invalid, but as a last deliberate defiance to the judgment of the world on that outrage. Still worse, perhaps, is the fifth clause of the fourth and last codicil, dated April 24, 1821, by which he left ten thousand francs to a junior French officer, Cantillon, for seeking to stab Wellington in Paris. True, the would-be murderer had been acquitted by a Paris jury, but that fact evidently weighed little with Napoleon, who declared that Cantillon had as much right to murder the oligarch as the latter had to send him to St Helena. He further accused the Duke of having violated the capitulation of Paris, thereby becoming 'responsible for the blood of the martyrs, Ney, La Bédoyère, etc., and for the crime of having despoiled the museums contrary to the text of treaties.' Napoleon must have known the falsity of all these charges against Wellington; and it is for ever regrettable that he soiled his fame by handing down to posterity, in the last document but one that he ever dictated (for the passage about the Duc d'Enghien was perhaps the last), three deliberate falsehoods as a justification for rewarding an attempt at murder.

On the same moral plane is the statement in the will

* Gourgaud, ii, 330, where Napoleon contrasts her with Josephine.

† 'Extract from a Diary of Rear-Admiral Sir George Cockburn,' p. 94 (London, 1888).

itself: 'I die prematurely, murdered by the English oligarchy and its assassin (*sicaire*): the English people will not be slow to avenge me.' On the day when these words were written (April 15), he knew that he was dying of cancer, the disease which carried off his father; the attentions of Dr Arnott, who had been expressly sent by Sir Hudson Lowe, were at that time far more effectual than those of Antommarchi, Napoleon's own doctor; and the patient recognised the fact, finally urging Bertrand and Montholon to effect a reconciliation with the Governor. The venomous phrase in the will must therefore be interpreted in the light of that significant declaration to Gourgaud which must be quoted in French:

'Ici, quoi qu'on dise, je puis faire, comme il me plaît, la réputation du gouverneur. Tout ce que je dirai contre lui, de ses mauvais traitements, de ses idées d'empoisonnement, sera cru.' ('Journal,' ii, 414.)

The will was the final stab at Sir Hudson Lowe.

It is hard to reconcile the last authenticated words of Napoleon with any heartfelt belief in Christianity. The probability would seem to be that he wavered between materialism and theism, inclining more and more to the latter belief as the years wore on, but never feeling for religion the keen interest that he always manifested for the arts of war and of government. Richly gifted as he was in all that pertained to the life of action, and by no means lacking originality and taste in the spheres of philosophy and literature, his nature was singularly barren on the side of religion. His best certified utterances on this topic are those of the politician rather than of the believer. In his active life he came to look on religion as the useful handmaid of the ruler; and his neglect of its real mission to the individual developed in him that hardness which was to be his bane as Emperor and his misfortune in exile. 'I repeat to you' (he said to Gourgaud on the occasion last cited) 'that you will strike your head against the rock, and that rock is myself.'

J. HOLLAND ROSE.

Art. III.—THE NOVELS OF MR HENRY JAMES.

Roderick Hudson (1876). *The American* (1877). *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881). *The Aspern Papers* (1888). *The Two Magics* (1898). *What Maisie Knew* (1898). *The Sacred Fount* (1901). *The Wings of the Dove* (1902). *The Better Sort* (1903). *The Ambassadors* (in progress, 1903).

‘They have a novelist with pretensions to literature, who writes about the chase for the husband and the adventures of the rich Americans in our corrupt old Europe, where their primeval candour puts the Europeans to shame. *C’est proprement écrit* ; but it’s terribly pale.’ (‘The Point of View.’)

THESE words are imputed, by the ingenious ‘novelist with pretensions,’ in an early tale of his own, to an imaginary Frenchman travelling in the States. They give a true if a jaunty account of the theme to which Mr Henry James devoted himself, with an almost constant affection, between 1876 and 1888. By that theme the larger public still know and define him ; they seldom read without some perplexity the books which he has written from 1892 onwards, and wherein he has come to his own. ‘*Roderick Hudson*’ and ‘*Daisy Miller*,’ ‘*The American*’ and ‘*The Portrait of a Lady*’—we do not name them to slight them ; we know them ; they are domesticated pleasures of old standing ; but, above all, they explain their successors, and in their light we read the later, more enigmatical, sometimes murkier stories, which the critics either let off with general empty praise, or handle with suspicion like some strange fruit that might appear on a familiar tree. It is really the same fruit enriched by new graftings. ‘The adventures of the rich Americans in our corrupt old Europe’ are revived, with a difference, in the masterpiece of last year, ‘*The Wings of the Dove*,’ which would thus justify, if need were, those earlier experiments. The author has travelled far ; but he is the same man, the same puritan, half-escaped, who made ‘*The Portrait of a Lady*,’ the deepest work of his earlier life. He is not a cosmopolitan even yet ; he never was one. He is better ; he understands other countries, but does not adopt them ; for his last heroine, the ‘*Dove*,’ is the soul of New England, his own country.

On the threshold of that earlier time, Mr Henry James hung out several clues to the temper in which he wrote. The 'Essays on French Poets and Novelists' (1878) show a certain recoil from the models, like Balzac or Flaubert, who were then still in the ascendant. He was hardly just to Balzac then, missing in him, perhaps, the still small voice, and preferring the fine and recondite class of artist, to which he himself belongs, before the hearty and assertive creators. There was much in Tourgenieff, on whom he wrote with zeal, to quicken the congenial talent of Mr James; the sad reserve, the pessimism, the delicacy; and the interest in heartbreaking, ineffectual persons, like Dmitri Rudin or Roderick Hudson. We have no right to say that Mr James was much affected by George Eliot; but he was writing during her full vogue, and shared with her in a certain atmosphere, perhaps at first familiar to him in his own land. The weight of distressed and severe scruple is felt in his early tales. Osmond, the egoist and alleged fine gentleman in 'The Portrait of a Lady,' who fetters and torments a generous wife, is of the race of Grandcourt in 'Daniel Deronda.' The wife, Isabel, instead of accepting the fierce offers of her American suitor, who is at least a man, goes back, though childless and untrammelled, to the conventional life of wifely duty and misery. It may be in keeping that she should do so, but the author seems to approve. And Mr James loved, like the Russian, to close his scene in discord and failure. 'The American,' Newman, robbed of his French bride by the caste-rancour of her family, sees his revenge, but sees it is not worth while to take it, and finds at the last that his enemies had all the while counted on his good nature not to take it. This kind of ending, which baffles men at the last moment by some malign turn of fortune, was to become characteristic of Mr James, for he is fond of the cruel slip between the cup and the lip.

Moreover, he stands with the writers we have named by virtue of the emphasis he lays on women and of his keen feminine insight, if we may so call it, into men. Some of his young girls are painted in our memories beside Helena and Lisa. Often, while we see only the actions of the men, we are told the feelings of the women, or, at least, of the good ones. Several of the stories are nar-

rated by a girl or spinster, or by some nondescript, rather felinely observant man of letters, who understands things that are hid from the virile. And there is nearly always passion. In the early books that of the men is intimated rather as it presents itself to the women, while that of the women seems more deeply felt. Such distinguishing marks continue into the later tales, transformed in colouring. But along with this special sort of analysis went the higher prevailing mood in the middle Victorian years—the mood of George Eliot, of Browning, and even, in his slighter fashion, of Tennyson. They and their aims were noble; and their nobleness informs their best work, while it cannot save the rest. Not on any time in our literature has the national stamp of moral vigour been so clearly printed. It was a century of preachers, and we are only now turning round to ask what, after all, they said. Their praise has been inscribed by Mr James in words he wrote after the death of Browning:—

‘He played with the curious and the special; they never submerged him, and it was a sign of his robustness that he could play till the end. His voice sounds loudest, and also clearest, for the things that, as a race, we like best . . . the fascination of faith, the acceptance of life, the respect for its mysteries, the endurance of its charges, the vitality of the will, the validity of character, the beauty of action, the seriousness, above all, of great human passion.’

Such, we may say, was the clear charter of Mr Henry James himself for the first fifteen years of his artistic life. He was too true a craftsman to let idealism jar his hand. He never, as some do, rushed in a black coat upon the stage amongst his own actors in order to harangue the house with what the age of Addison called ‘the Sentiments.’ But the idealising spirit is there, and it finds somewhat simple expression. There is a conflict in nearly every story; and it is not merely waged between American and European, the latter usually preying on the wealth and simplicity of the former. We are almost led back to religious parlance in describing it. It is the conflict of complication and corruption with what is simple, single-hearted, and fresh. The world and the spirit are at odds; the intricate world, with its deeps of old energy, so much more telling and resourceful than its

victim, full of swagger and colour, and craft and will; and the spirit, in some frail or quaint, but brave embodiment, relying only on itself. 'Lady Barberina' is a dumbly stubborn, almost malign, English girl of rank who carries back her New York husband in his own despite from his country to live among her aristocratic friends. Daisy Miller is deliberately exposed to fatal malaria by the little Italian suitor who has no hope of winning her. Isabel Osmond is married for her money and utilised. In 'The Europeans' the theme is pleasingly varied; the dull-eyed Gertrude, alien in mind, follows her foreign cousin and husband away for ever from her charming, rectilineal home. But in most cases love and hope are defeated either by evil or by circumstance—by conspiracy, or the unfitness of the object, or prejudice. The struggle, therefore, lies rather between persons than within characters, and there is no perturbation of the sympathies. Indeed, there is a touch of emphasis about the adventuresses and hard old women which makes them stand out in a rather suspicious brightness beside the quiet and lucid truth of the American portraits.

If Mr Henry James had ceased to write about 1890, he might have been remembered for his choice of this fresh, distinct plot of ground, for his happy and varied cultivation of it. The flowers were a little 'pale,' but full of tender, clear colour, unlike any others. There was humour; and the pages were full of a softly stinging wit. The English was that of the easy classical tradition, a little chequered, as befitted the scene, with the French and American tongues. It was careful; it flowed and did not stick; it did not first of all try to express embroiled feeling or imperceptible changes of temperature. In a few pieces, like 'The Aspern Papers' (1888), the style might have seemed more tense, and the subject bizarre and a little ghostly. But few would have forecast this as the future field of the novelist. 'The Princess Casamassima,' with its wonderful opening scene of tragic rage, wandered into some extravagance. These were experiments; the account might seem to have been closed.

But the century wore out, and over our fiction there came the breath of a stranger temper, different from that of the gallant Victorian crusaders. It was natural that

no writer of English should be quicker than Mr James to feel any artistic current from the mainland that might tardily wash our shores. And, in fact, amongst his later books we find ourselves in presence of the much-talked-of 'decadence,' of the mood that speaks so variously in the 'Master-Builder' and 'Jude the Obscure,' in 'Pelléas and Mélisande' and 'La-Bas.' Many are the dialects, but we feel there is one fundamental idiom, which the literary historian must seek to state hereafter, just as he is now trying to state that of 'realism' or of the older romance. We are still in the 'decadence,' and can see little more than the confusions of the term. It might mean the decay of plastic power at large; but art is hardly at present suffering from that. It may mean a failure of largeness and nobleness in the treatment, a decline of spiritual energy; but no one can seriously ascribe such a failure to Maeterlinck or Sudermann, or, we may add, to Mr Henry James. Lastly, 'decadence' may imply a love of subjects which are aloof from the general lot of man, of dark and confused moral issues, of the study of problematic or twisted natures, in contrast with the daily and usual; in a word, it implies the temper of the specialist. Much literature now written has these marks; but then 'decadence' is not the term to use; for there is only a fresh lease, a diversion, a different concentration of talent. Donne was not a decadent; he was a renewer and explorer. And so in the case of Mr Henry James, the question is in what ways the new temper has come to tinge his expression, or to deepen and restate the relatively simple issues that once engrossed him.

During the last twelve years Mr James has printed some fifty or sixty stories, of which seven or eight are long enough to be called books. They are not all equally significant; some of them tease the reader more than he deserves. But there is no monotony; the design is different and peculiar in each, deriving from some curious and cruel knot that has never been tied before. The rigid intellect is always at exercise, though at times upon matter all but impalpable. With all the surface intricacy that is produced by a web of fine threads intently complicated, the texture is firm as well as dense. Strength of passionate situation, always with a certain oddity, an intense curiosity for rare cases, is everywhere present.

Sometimes the passion is softened into the mood of high comedy, but it is never far away. 'Lord Beaupré,' a rich young heir, in order to stave off the pursuit of a fortune-hunting girl, gets his friendly cousin to consent to a mock engagement between them. The tensions and delicacies of the position all come out; the cousin is kept all the more by this very device, in pure modesty, from showing her real heart to Lord Beaupré. She accepts an American; Lord Beaupré falls to the fortune-hunter. The style adopted for this kind of tale (1893), light, fine, and sensitive, is not very different from that of 1876; the full change in the author's style has come during the last five or six years—the change to an instrument of registration still more responsive; parenthetical, colloquial, elliptical, unpopular, full of new difficult music, that repays while it taxes the ear.

The stories of Mr James are liable to raise an obscure discomfort in the English reader, resembling that caused by want of air. They are tales of the private life only; men of our race are not quite easy under that limitation. Across the page of Tourgénéieff, of Balzac, of George Eliot, of George Meredith, of Stendhal, there blows the wind of historic events and national aspirations. Reading them, we think of the liberation of the serfs, of 1848, of the Reform Bill, of Mazzini and Italy, of Waterloo, of the world's destinies. But for the characters of Mr James no such things exist; there is a void, a darkness that can be felt, surrounding their particular lot. We have no right to complain of such an exclusion, though we want sometimes to open a window and hear the clamour of the bigger life. What is odder in an artist and thinker, the world of art and thought is hardly to be detected at all in these novels. Mr James's painters and men of letters are merely ticketed as such; they never say anything to show it, or get out of their personal affairs into the region that they are supposed to speak for. They are mostly illustrations of failure; they die before they have expressed themselves, they work for the profit of others—perhaps of publishers. We are told that they are really eminent, but the interest is, in fact, centred on some one by their side who admires them or suffers for them.

On the other hand, the able editors, small pressmen, journalising ladies lunching in bun-shops, and reporting

Americans, dance across the microscopic 'field,' and are lively creatures indeed; never yet so deftly captured by any collector for exhibition. Innocent or shady Bohemia, sinking down to penury and silence, or clambering up into the recognised classes; wealth that is just outside those classes, but wishes to enter them on the strength of having beauty to offer; the stable, placid, English orders themselves, in their country houses, on their lawns, with possibilities of woe and excruciation there also; the routes of travel, the great capitals, Venice, Paris, Rome, New York, serving as the background for these same persons on their voyages; and London, to which they all return; London, whose murmur is caught again and again, as a kind of tragic refrain to the curious chant; over all this world Mr Henry James moves with practised step, knowing quickly where he wishes to arrive, and wasting no time on what he does not know. His essay on our great city, written some while since, gives us the stage on which many of his romances are unfolded. Lovers of the poetry of London and of the heady London spring, with the fumes that rise from the earth into the brain amid a chorus of innumerable wheels and horsehoofs; those who feel her landscape, who hear the rhythm of her call to her children, offering them both the best and the worst—such will know that her setting of dim noise and her canopy of softening mist, with the sense of infinite life—thrown back, though, and not intruding—just serve to relieve and enhance these peculiar dramas, so personal, so remote from the ordinary, and for that very reason possible nowhere but in the heart of the place where all things happen;

‘Chronicle at once

And burial-place of passions, and their home
Imperial, their chief living residence.’

The natural heart of London is the parks, with their ‘smuttred sheep’ and grassy distances; and the parks often are the scene of drama. Here, in the northern alleys, with life moving breathlessly between them, Kate Croy and her lover, in ‘The Wings of the Dove,’ pace together, full of hope and defiance, to exchange their vows:

‘Suddenly she said to him with extraordinary beauty: “I engage myself to you for ever.”

'The beauty was in everything, and he could have separated nothing—couldn't have thought of her face as distinct from the whole joy. Yet her face had a new light. "And I pledge you—I call God to witness!—every spark of my faith; I give you every drop of my life." That was all, for the moment, but it was enough, and it was almost as quiet as if it were nothing. They were in the open air, in an alley of the Gardens; the great space, which seemed to arch just then higher and spread wider for them, threw them back into deep concentration' (p. 80).

The tide of actual life is beating there. But, on the other hand, the gift and scope of pure fantasy in this countryman and student of Hawthorne have hardly had proper recognition. Mr Henry James has perfected a certain kind of preternatural story. The use of the uncanny for sharp and light satire is well shown in 'The Private Life.' A distinguished writer is introduced, who is oddly common and second-rate in society, so that his friends wonder how his books are written. But there are really two persons: the other is the hidden familiar, genius or double, who writes the books and who plays hide-and-seek with his earthly companion in a style that even the observant can never quite bring home to either. Beside the man of letters, moreover, there is another personage—a man of the world—who is composed of nothing but infinite tact, a social leader who never says anything in particular, but always the right thing. But it is only in society that he has even a physical existence; when he is alone he goes out. He is virtually a hallucination on the part of other people. His wife has her suspicions of this rather perplexing attribute of nonentity, and tries to fend off inquiry. The supernatural is only a symbol here; we have all known such persons, or something like them. But in 'Sir Edmund Orme' there is an actual ghost, haunting the woman who has wronged him during life, and threatening to repeat the same curse upon her daughter if she repeats her mother's fickleness. The daughter just escapes incurring both the blame and the curse.

Mr James has put far more force into 'The Turn of the Screw,' one of the hideous stories of our language. Is any limitation placed on the choice of an artist by the mere measure of the pain he inflicts upon the nerves?

If not, then the subject is admissible. It is a tale where sinister and spectral powers are shown spoiling and daunting the innocence of the young. There might at first sight seem something wanton in the ruthless fancy—in the re-invasion of our life by the dead butler Peter Quint and his paramour; in the struggle with these visitants for the souls of the two young and beautiful children, a little boy and a little girl, whom in life they have already influenced; in the doubt, raised and kept hanging, whether, after all, the two ghosts, who can choose to whom they will appear, are facts or delusions of the young governess who tells the story; and in the final defeat of hope by the boy's death just at the moment when he may perhaps be saved. But on reflection we see that all this is the work of a symbolist and a puritan. The ghosts play their part in the bodily sphere as terrifying *dramatis personæ*—neither substance nor shadow—but *there*, as Gorgon faces at the window; while, spiritually, they figure as the survival of the poison, which, living, they had sown in the breasts of the innocents. When this influence re-awakens, the earthly form of the sowers gathers visible shape, at once as symbol and as actual combatant. The full effect is won by Mr James's gift, already adverted to, of speaking in the name of women. The whole visitation comes to us through its effect on the nerves, its stimulus to the courage, of the young English lady who desperately shelters the children unaided. The effect is heightened by the distrust with which others regard her story, and the aversion to her inspired by the ghosts in the children themselves.

Mr Henry James is skilled in the feat of drawing children or very young persons, either prematurely oppressed by tragedy or otherwise abnormally alive. The more we think, the less we feel that he is attracted by the mere pathology of such cases. But he once more recalls Tourgénéïeff by his strained acuteness of hearing for the quickenings, the forebodings, and the half-aware discoveries of the tender mind, during its morning twilight, as the walls of life loom and close about it, in their oppressive tyranny, too soon. Like Tourgénéïeff, he conveys these things by the method of reticence, by omissions, pauses, economies, rests in the talk, and speaking silences. There are, however, more ways than one of reticence in

literature. In his 'First Love' Tourgénéieff illustrates one of them; it is the reticence, the silence of startled Nature herself retreating to her fastnesses in the mind of a boy.

Mr James is possibly too prone to mystify by scattering restless hints and practising elaborate steps in order at once to hide and express what is brutally simple. In 'What Maisie Knew' there is something too much of that. Maisie is a little girl who has to spend half the year with each of two parents, who justly detest each other and are equally at fault in the eye of the law. The question 'what she knew,' to which the answer soon appears to be 'everything,' is happily resolved into the question how she shall escape; and the solution for once is not mere discomfiture. In 'The Awkward Age' there is just as much to 'know'; and known it certainly is. We are glad this particular interest does not detain such an artist long, for it is not illimitable, though it gives curious chances to his gift. In the gay, clean-cut, sad little anecdote of 'The Pupil,' the effect is less sinister. A family, who just struggle to be presentable and flit impecuniously over Europe, find a tutor, a poor collegian, for their boy, who is charming, precocious, and delicate. They trade on the tutor's love for the boy in order to defer the question of salary. The child sees everything, and dies just as he is hoping to escape with his friend. There is the sting of real life in this, and it is much better as a short story; for the endless folds and doublings of analysis in some of the longer books demand a specially-trained attention, like a scientific pursuit, and fatigue it like a race in a labyrinth. Mr James, we fear, loses more readers by this peculiarity than by anything.

In some of these sketches Mr James crosses the border between the serious comedy of manners and high tragedy. 'The Beast in the Jungle,' issued lately in the collection called 'The Better Sort,' might easily have been matter for some dramatic monologue of Browning. It contains, perhaps, the nearest thing in all his prose to a great and superb 'bravura' passage. He tries rarely—too rarely—for such effects; language always responds to him when he does try. A man is haunted by the fear of some unnamed disaster, or unknown harm, leaping on him out of his own nature—out of the 'jungle'; and he seeks the good and friendly offices of a woman to listen to him and

comfort him. He is wrapped up in himself, and does not see until she is dead that she has loved him. Over her grave he finds it out, and he discovers also, in the face of a passing mourner—a stranger—what the tragic loss of love once enjoyed may really mean. He sees that the beast has leapt upon him indeed, in the form he least suspected. It is clear how the conception of tragic futility, which has been present to Mr Henry James ever since his first sketches, remains, in a sense, the same; but with what an extraordinary transformation! Let us be thankful for the 'decadence' that brings these gifts. And it has also to be said that the happier and more peaceful tones of poetry are not absent. 'The Altar of the Dead,' but for not being dramatic in form, is like a pensive play of M. Maeterlinck in its unencumbered impulse towards beauty. 'The Great Good Place' is a kind of cloistral dream-refuge for the tired artist from the clatter of London, a house of the fancy, whence all that jars or wearies or sterilises is resolutely banished. The soft rhythms of the prose make us wish for more of this kind, even to the loss of the stories of a few 'trivial sphinxes' and adventuresses:—

'The fragrance of flowers just wandered through the void, and the quiet recurrence of delicate plain fare in a high, clean refectory where the soundless, simple service was the triumph of art. That, as he analysed, remained the constant explanation: all the sweetness and serenity were created, calculated things. He analysed, however, but in a desultory way and with a positive delight in the residuum of mystery that made for the great artist in the background the innermost shrine of the idol of a temple; there were odd moments for it, mild meditations when, in the broad cloister of peace or some garden-nook where the air was light, a special glimpse of beauty and reminder of felicity, seemed, in passing, to hover and linger.' ('The Better Sort.')

Again, in 'The Sacred Fount' (1901), so full of faint, mazy figures that the superscription might have been 'Come like shadows, so depart!' a single scene is left surely on the mind—a summer garden at evening, with a desolate feminine shape sitting in its useless perfume and silence.

Each of the larger novels published since 1895, 'The Other House,' 'The Spoils of Poynton,' and 'The Awkward

Age,' would be worthy of studious review. It is curious how the passion for the scenery of the English country house and 'grounds' recurs in them, as in the delightful 'Covering End.' But the fresh gifts, the motives, the newly-modulated style that they reveal are all more perfectly apparent in 'The Wings of the Dove,' the most remarkable book that Mr James has written. It has been relatively little noticed amid the mart of dreadfully competent fiction. But, wherever it has penetrated, it is likely, after the manner of certain plays of Ibsen, to leave a long wake of disputation, partly over the question as to what actually happens in the story, and partly about the rights and wrongs of the solution. Hence a fuller analysis may be pardoned; for the book resumes so much that went before in the author's production, and intensifies so sharply the changes in his temper, that to know 'The Wings of the Dove' is to know much of Mr Henry James. He has gone back to his old topic of the rich American in Europe; and the contending parties have, in a sense, the same symbolism as before. The world and the spirit are afresh in conflict on the trodden battle-ground. But the arts of war, offensive and defensive, have been transformed in the interval; there are forces in the air that were unknown to the Osmonds and Madame Merles of an earlier day. And—chief alteration of all—the sympathies are entangled with both sides. The puritan dualism, so to call it, of the older books is greatly blunted; and the artist, borne along by his own discoveries, comes to bend his intensest and finest light upon the arch-conspirator, who nearly supplants her intended victim in tragic and intellectual interest. Moreover, there is no sharp solution by the sword of justice, moral or poetical. It belongs, also, to the movement of our time—which, as Matthew Arnold well said, is a 'lay' one—that nothing could be more wholly of this life, without hint or doctrine of a second world, than the tales of Mr James. Very seldom, with a still questioning irony, something else seems to be indicated. The dove-like heroine dies, and the event is canvassed by a worldly old lady and the man who might have been her husband.

"Our dear dove, then, as Kate calls her, has folded her wonderful wings."

"Yes—folded them."

'It rather racked him, but he tried to receive it as she intended, and she evidently took his formal assent for self-control. "Unless it's more true," she accordingly added, "that she has spread them the wider."

'He again but formally assented, though, strangely enough, the words fitted an image deep in his own consciousness. "Rather, yes—spread them the wider."

"For a flight, I trust, to some happiness greater——"

"Exactly. Greater," Densher broke in; but now with a look, he feared, that did, a little, warn her off' (p. 538).

But this is to forestall the history itself, which tells of a fray unprecedented enough.

The world first! The tale opens in the back, shady regions—surely on the south side of the Thames—where Mr George Gissing moves so easily, knowing them as a man might know his own house in the dark. The hard and gray tones lower the pulse of the spectator. Mr Henry James, when he wishes, can visit the same scene; but it is with the fresh-edged perceptions of one coming from another society altogether, and not yet accustomed to the voices and smells and tints of this one. In a small room in 'Chirk Street,' Kate Croy awaits her impossible, jaunty father, who has done something which reticence cannot specify, but who is 'all pink and silver,' with 'kind, safe eyes,' and an inimitable manner, and 'indescribable arts that quite turned the tables.' Here Kate tastes 'the faint, flat emanation of things, the failure of fortune and of honour.' The interview is a triumph of acrid comedy; the talk of Croy fully bears out his inventory. This nameless parent (her mother has died of her troubles) stands aside from the story, but is necessary in order to explain Kate. He is that from which she flies; yet she has sprung from him. She flies, by instinct, upwards in society, on the wings of the hawk, not of the dove; no mere kite, but a predatory creature of a larger sweep, with nobilities, with weaknesses after all. She flies to the only life in which she can imagine herself—where there is room for her will, room for her beauty—chances for her marriage, chances for winning money, and station, and love as well, and not merely one of these things without the rest. When she leaves the house we know something of Kate; her exhalation of silent power, her disregard of all cost to herself in pursuit of her quest,

her mysterious, undeniable nobleness of stamp, which we must reconcile as best we can with her later piracies and perversities. Already she has got away from her father and her weariful widowed sister, whom, by the way, she supports with her own inheritance. Her aunt in Lancaster Gate, Mrs Lowder, the 'Aunt Maud' of the story, has seen the value of Kate. She is a girl who might, and must, marry a 'great man,' and so satisfy the dowager affections and long-delayed ambitions of her aunt. Thus they would both escape from the amphibious society in which they move, into that region of the London world which is really 'great.' Fielding would have rejoiced in this view of 'greatness.' Their ambition, at bottom vulgar, is embraced by them with a religious gravity. The author himself almost seems to take it too seriously, at moments.

Kate, in her revulsion from Chirk Street, is ready enough for this programme, but for one obstacle. She loves a man who can never be great at all. He is merely a journalist of some parts, with a foreign education, Merton Densher, who from the standpoint of Mrs Lowder is inadmissible. It would seem that Kate must either resign Densher or her expectations. She is weak; she cannot give up her expectations. But she is also strong; for she is prepared to play high, and to wait for an opportunity of winning both, should such present itself. It does present itself; there is the story, but there also is the tragedy. Meantime let her have her precarious, whole-hearted, stolen happiness, walking pledged in Kensington Gardens.

The difficulties sharpen. Densher is visiting on terms of sufferance, which are dissected to the thinnest point, at the house in Lancaster Gate, where the hostess accepts him because she feels she can crush him at any time, and positively likes him all the while. A certain 'Lord Mark' who is asserted rather than proved to be uncannily clever, but who is wanted for the conduct of the tragedy, is on the watch; and in any case Kate must tarry for the great man who is not yet forthcoming. At this point Densher is sent by his newspaper office to America to make articles. Kate's opportunity for high play is not ripe till his return. Unaware she waits the coming of the 'Dove.'

Milly Theale, strangely and richly left, the dying flower of an old wild family, carrying in herself, too, the seeds of an undefined malady, and, further, the memory of three calls paid to her in New York by a young Englishman, Densher—Milly Theale is found in Europe, whither she has restlessly fled with a lady escort, a simple, but not foolish, little New Englander, by profession a furnisher of novels. Fled, from what? and whither? From the fear and from the memory, which accompany her nevertheless. The method of reticence, of dumb actions and silences, is here followed worthily. The reader, as well as Milly's companion, Mrs Stringham, are cunningly let into the secret, which is stoically kept. It comes out by degrees, on a wooded pass, in the little parlours of the inns; and before England is reached the charm is felt by the reader, who knows the pale face, coppery hair, and the radiation, strong, soft, and beneficent, of the lonely, wealthy woman, who 'thinks,' when congratulated, that she has *not* 'really everything.' To England they go; Mrs Stringham remembers an old friend, Mrs Lowder, now high in the world; and with her the Americans are next found in company, without it being at first known that Densher is a common acquaintance.

The Dove has to face fresh waters, that welcome her, unsparing as they may prove later, more than graciously at first. The opening dinner-party is described, from the point of view of Milly, with Richardsonian prolixity; the dinner itself could hardly take longer. But this is Mr Henry James's way of enhancing his illusion. The persons move, through a strange, turbid medium, towards a dramatic comprehension of one another. We hear slowly—but we do not wish the tale shorter—how the two girls, Kate Croy and Milly, become intimate; how they discover, without words, that both know and think of Densher; how Milly betrays her passion to the 'onyx-eyed Aunt Maud'; how Densher returns, visits the National Gallery as a rendezvous with Kate, and is thus beheld by Milly as she sits there forlornly 'counting the Americans.' In one scene, which precedes this incident, the doom of Milly is foreshadowed. Milly is taken by Lord Mark, who is trying to wrap invisible nets round the heiress, to a great house, in order that she may be

seen in his company. He brings her up to an old picture, 'by Bronzino,' of a fair, dead lady to whom she has a surprising chance likeness.

'She found herself, for the first moment, looking at the mysterious portrait through tears. Perhaps it was her tears that made it just then so strange and fair—as wonderful as he had said: the face of a young woman, all magnificently drawn, down to the hands, and magnificently dressed; a face almost livid in hue, yet handsome in sadness and crowned with a mass of hair, rolled back and high, that must, before fading with time, have had a family resemblance to her own. The lady in question, at all events, with her slightly Michaelangellesque squareness, her eyes of other days, her full lips, her long neck, her recorded jewels, her brocaded and wasted reds, was a very great personage, only unaccompanied by a joy. And she was dead, dead, dead. Milly recognised her exactly in words that had nothing to do with her. "I shall never be better than this"' (p. 183).

This is but one of many passages that show how Mr James has shared in the special impulse towards beauty which distinguishes the new generation. Such an American as Milly Theale becomes, by her rich ancestry, by her affinity of type to the master-painting, herself a member of an old world, no longer merely simple-minded and delightfully puritan, but with all kinds of complicated stirrings and concessions that might surprise her countrywomen. And the style of Mr James gathers, itself, the dignity of an old master's as it rises to the expression of these deeper and more dramatic things. It has become more and more charged with beauty; it marches with slow, intricately measured paces, as in a dream; and, in this book, even the harsher incidents and cruelties of the story do not prove too much for the style. It would be idle to credit younger Belgian or Celtic symbolists with a definite influence in any direction upon Mr James. This kind of enchantment is now in the air of literature; and Mr Henry James, in the fullness of his powers, has returned spell for spell.

Soon Milly knows how she stands. A big, clear-witted physician, Sir Luke Strett, with his 'fine, closed face,' comes into her life. It is implied that she will die, or die the sooner, unless she has the happiness, the marriage that she needs. The doctor tells her, significantly, to

'live'; and that she wishes to do. The scenes in his consulting-room form one of the many accessory perfections of the book. Soon Sir Luke sees that Densher is the man. Soon they all see, they all crowd round from different sides. Mrs Lowder is willing he should be tempted away, so that Kate may be free for greatness. Kate herself has to act, and the critical episodes begin. Mr James has tried hard to render probable the bold and ugly scheme which she devises on behalf of herself and her lover. May it be conjectured that, having first thought of this central motive, he proceeded to invent backwards explanatory antecedents for Kate Croy, which should leave her capable of a crime even against her own passion; that he made her, nevertheless, a woman of large build, of sympathy, full of heart and pieties of her own kind; and that when the moment came for unscrupulous action, behold, she was too good for the work? So Chaucer, when his authorities tell him that the time is due for Cressida to be false to Troilus, has himself spent too much kindness on her to believe it, and refers, somewhat shamefacedly, to the 'books' to prove the fact. Kate goes wrong, but not in Cressida's way. At this point there is a change in the method of painting her, which serves to cover any violence in the transition. We are never again in her confidence as before, the curtain is dropped, and the story becomes a diary not of her feelings, but of the feelings of Densher. Thus any struggle in the mind of Kate is unknown. The second great difficulty of the author is to make Densher her accomplice, and to incline him to acquiesce in the false report that, while he is desperate for Kate, Kate is averse from him. On this footing of a person to be pitied he drifts, by delicate degrees, into the position of an intimate with Milly, whom she is ready to console.

The plan is virtually a kind of dubious, low insurance job; Mr Henry James has never invented anything so extraordinary. Densher, while privately pledged to Kate, is to 'make up to a sick girl' who wishes to gain him, but who may die, after not too long an interval, leaving him well endowed and free to marry Kate. He is to pay certain premiums, for a term, in the way of simulated love; but he pays them on a 'bad life'; when that life 'determines' (these images are not used in the

book) he is to receive the millions for which the policy has been taken out. The full position only comes home to him slowly; by the time he realises it the action is ready for the most startling turn of all. Man, woman, and fate conspire at first for the success of the plot, and the scene shifts to Venice, which 'plashed and chimed and called again' in sympathy, until cold and wicked weather, also in sympathy with events, set in. Every one is present. For their beauty and strange grace these Venetian chapters, let us prophesy frankly, may come to be thought a classic in their kind. For the Dove, as her frail body fades in her palace, begins, in ways unforeseen, to prevail, though she seems to be deceived, and for a while is deceived, with the hope of 'living.' It is on Densher that the strain works. He knows what manner of man he is, when Milly, 'in all the candour of her smile, the lustre of her pearls, the value of her life, the essence of her wealth,' looks across her own hall at himself and Kate as they are furtively discussing the consequences her death may bring to themselves. Densher is not easy in mind, and his next act makes the knot insoluble indeed.

He cannot go on with his part in the game without realities. There, in the palace of Milly, he tells Kate what encouragement she must give him. She has ruled his action thus far; it is now the turn of the male. He has a lodging, a little dim old place, on one of the canals. If she comes to him, he will be immutably forced to go through with their programme. Kate sees, and blanches; but consents, and goes. This, by a deep but sound paradox, is the first sign that Densher is shaken by the influence of the Dove. For anything like this conception, and the way it is faced, we must go back to the freedoms of Jacobean tragedy.

The visit of Kate to the lodging is not narrated, though some inferior authors would have felt bound on theory to narrate it. Economy is in its place here. Tolstoi would have forbore to tell it, but might, as in 'Anna Karénina,' instantly have informed us that there was an after-taste of sick humiliation. But there was not. Nothing is told us but the preliminary compact, and then the man's after-taste, in the lonely lodging, of glory and absorption. At this point we remember that psychology is in the blood of

Mr Henry James. The present, in such a case, is scientifically indescribable; it is an illusion, indeed it is *nil* if abstracted from its sequel; its life is in hopes and memories; their faintness, their vividness renewed in rhythmical fashion, their sudden chasing away by a new, black train of associations. Densher is left alone in Venice to carry out his agreement, and another chapter follows of equal power, showing the heavy cruelty of the new situation for all parties.

The Dove, now dying, and waiting vainly for her hopes, acts upon Densher in another paradoxical but natural way. The pursuit of her, after what has passed, seems to him more than ever necessary, if he is not utterly to cheat Kate, but less than ever possible, the Dove being the noble person that she is. After a little the very possibility is denied him. 'Susan Shepherd,' Mrs Stringham, who has followed everything silently, like some clairvoyant animal, comes to give him a last chance; she will accept anything, that her friend's last ray of happiness may be made possible. Densher is kept back from going through with his bond by a host of little cords of conscience and distaste, and soon it is too late. He has a final, astonishing interview with the dying lady, in which she receives him with invincible style, in full dress, refusing 'to smell of drugs, to taste of medicine.' What passed no others know: the interview is only mentioned in a later conversation with Kate; and Kate is not the person to hear its details—does not wish to hear them. But we gather that Milly, while knowing much, and divining we know not how much more—knowing certainly, since a malicious, finally killing revelation by Lord Mark, that she had been lied to, and that Kate had really cared for Densher throughout—Milly *pardons*. This divine impression is left on Densher: her last words

'Enforce attention, like deep harmony.'

Thus Milly prevails. Having lost all, she regains everything—not practically, but in the sphere of love, soul, and devotion, in which she moves, and in which Densher must henceforth be said to live a kind of absolved existence. Even practically, as the sequel shows, she exerts a decisive influence.

For the memory of her is now fixed in Densher. His

experience of power and craft, of passion secular and unshrinking, is overborne by an experience yet stronger. The waft of the Dove's wings as she fled has altered him. He has, in a sense, killed her; he would not have her; now she, and not Kate, is mistress of *him*. By the same token, he is false to Kate. Where, then, is there an issue?

Nothing so vulgar is suggested as that possession had cooled Densher towards Kate: that is not the point at all. But another power, 'through creeks and inlets making,' controls him. He comes home to England, and the final act is played. All that went before is really nothing as compared with his present complication with Kate. And the last beneficent action of the Dove adds another coil to the tangle. He resumes, with a difference, his old wanderings with Kate; the change is best expressed in his phrase that they are 'damned civil' to each other. Kate is strong still, strong to the last. Though Densher has not married Milly, she guesses that she has gained her end nevertheless—without, for that matter, having had to pay the expected price of seeing him Milly's husband for a time. So far she has guessed right. Milly has left him a great fortune. Her last letter comes, in which he would have seen, had he read it, the wonderful and gracious turn she would have given to her bequest. Kate burns the unopened letter, when he offers it to her, under the sway of a wholly new feeling, which is out of her usual reckoning altogether—jealousy of the dead. This is one of the many profundities of the tale. Kate could bear to see her lover marry Milly without love; she cannot bear to see him in love with Milly dead. But she sees that the centres of his life have shifted; he is all with the dead, with the letter that is ashes. But he is still true in act to Kate. The business letter announcing the fortune comes from America; he sends this letter to her to 'test' her; she is positive-minded, she does not understand the 'test,' and she reads it. Densher refuses to read it, and the final crisis comes. He pursues his last sad advantage with Kate. He will not touch the money for himself. There must be a kind of expiation. Either she must marry him poor, as he was of old: or, he will make over the money to her; but in that case he will not marry her. Such at least seems to be the meaning of the latter pages. Thus the spirit of the Dove penetrates material life, as

the ether penetrates the most stubborn substances of the earth. The strong, consistent person is at the disadvantage; the half-baked man, who has a conscience, but had not nerve enough to carry the policy through, is, in his converted state, the dominant partner. In the last sentences of the book Kate challenges him with being in love with the dead. He makes no answer, but says :

"I'll marry you, mind you, in an hour."

"As we were?"

"As we were."

But she turned to the door, and her headshake was now the end.

"We shall never be again as we were!"' (p. 576.)

So the tale ends. It is easy to ask the wrong question, to ask, What happens? Do they marry, or does she take the money? Probably she marries Lord Mark. But it does not matter. What matters is that it is the end of two personalities, the final unsoldering of the alliance so exquisitely sealed in Kensington Gardens. The irruption of forces from another world has done this. Other questions, equally hard but more profitable, we are forced to ask. What has the Dove accomplished by her high generosity? Spoilt, if we look into the matter, what she wished to mend. She had made the bequest in order that the two might be free as they desired. But they have no use for freedom. With whom does the sympathy finally remain? With the man, who through his very weakness, his two-sidedness, has been in a sense regenerate? Or with the partner, proud, strong, and true to her strange self, who has given herself unflinchingly, and is now dispossessed of her reward? Let us say that our sympathy is with her, as it would never have been had she simply succeeded.

We can put such questions without end. The book is not like a great tragedy of the older kind, which ends in some ennobling resolution of errors through death. It ends in a deep, resonant discord. But such a discord equally has its place in art, for it might actually close just such a passage of significant, tumultuous life. The conflict between the world and the spirit, with which we started, has ended drawn; the spirit has conquered in its own sphere; the world has been disconcerted and baffled. But

Kate, the embodiment of the world, is not wholly eclipsed. She remains pathetic, dignified even after her failure, and above all strong. The last word is hers. The interest, almost the benediction of the author, goes with her. That marks, like much else, the long slow change in his way of facing life. The victims in his earlier novels were the clear-souled and innocent. Milly Theale is such a victim, certainly; but the sufferer, the protagonist, foiled by forces beyond her scope, yet holding firm, and remaining, in her own style, noble, is Kate, the daughter of Lionel Croy. Thus the interest and even the beauty begin to gather at last to the side of the will, craft, and energy that have failed in part and are now thrown back with little but themselves to live upon. In affairs and political theories the cult of these things is just now evident; and art also is touched by it—more legitimately. In this way, with his share in the specialist's temper, and his love for 'strangeness in beauty,' Mr Henry James, aloof as he appears, is trebly representative—one of the finer voices that may be heard telling the future for what sort of things our time cared.

OLIVER ELTON.



Art. IV.—OUR ORCHARDS AND FRUIT-GARDENS.

1. *The Fruit-Grower's Guide*. By John Wright, F.R.H.S., V.M.H. Three vols. London: Virtue, 1893.*
2. *The Gardener's Assistant*. By Robert Thompson. Third edition, revised and remodelled by William Watson. Two vols. London: Gresham Publishing Co., 1902.
3. *Report on the Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm*. By the Duke of Bedford, K.G., and Spencer U. Pickering, F.R.S. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1903.
4. *The Soil*. By A. D. Hall, M.A. London: Murray, 1903.
5. *Compensation for Fruit-Planting*. By C. H. Hooper, F.S.I. ('Transactions of the Surveyors' Institution,' vol. xxxiv.) London, 1902.
6. *Practical Fruit-Culture*. By J. Cheal, F.R.H.S. London: Bell, 1892.
7. *Quick Fruit-Culture*. By John Simpson. Sheffield: Rawson and Brailsford, 1900.
8. *The Principles of Fruit-Growing*. By L. H. Bailey. London: Macmillan, 1897.
9. *Packing and Selling Fruit and Vegetables*. Gold Medal Essay, written for the Company of Fruiterers. By R. Lewis Castle, F.R.H.S. London: Collingridge, 1903.
10. *An Encyclopædia of Gardening*. By T. W. Sanders, F.L.S. Sixth edition, enlarged. London: Collingridge, 1903.

VARIOUS influences have combined to give a great impetus to the production of fruit in this country during the last twenty years. Shortly before the beginning of that period agricultural depression turned the thoughts of cultivators of the soil to products more profitable than the ordinary crops of the farm; the growing demand for fruit, partly based upon the enormous development of the jam industry, suggested fruit-growing as an undertaking open to considerable expansion; and certain public bodies, with many individual experts, gave valuable guidance to those who knew nothing about the industry, as well as to others who, although engaged in it, had not previously learned how to carry it on to the best advantage.

* This work is to be obtained only from Messrs Virtue direct.

Mr John Wright, for many years editor of the 'Journal of Horticulture,' whose labours in this connexion have not been surpassed, perhaps, by those of any other man, dates the improvement of fruit-growing from 1883, when the Royal Horticultural Society convened the National Apple Congress at Chiswick. Over 10,000 dishes of apples were exhibited, in 1540 distinct varieties, of which about 1500 might be regarded as superfluous from a commercial point of view. The speeches delivered at the meeting attracted wide-spread attention, especially to the need of improving, or replacing by fresh plantations, the neglected and degenerated apple-orchards, then common in most parts of the country. The Pear Congress followed in 1884, with 6269 exhibits, comprising 651 varieties; while at the Apple and Pear Congress, held four years later, the entries were deliberately limited to varieties deemed worth extensive cultivation. Perhaps even greater popular attention was attracted to the great show of fruit collected for the Company of Fruiterers in the Guildhall, London, in 1890. This exhibition was so successfully arranged under Mr Wright's superintendence that he was presented with the freedom of the City in recognition of his services. These exhibitions and the discussions held at the congresses helped materially to advance the movement in favour of extended and improved fruit-culture; and, since 1895, the magnificent fruit shows of the Royal Horticultural Society, held at the Crystal Palace, have also had a wide-spread influence.

Many able and expert writers had served as pioneers to the movement under notice before it began to take definite shape. Of the few whose works were noticed in an article on 'Garden Farming' in this Review for April 1888, some, though happily not all, have passed away. They were Dr Hogg, Mr A. F. Barron, Mr Charles Whitehead, Mr J. Wright, Mr Thomas Rivers, and Mr George Bunyard. Mr Hogg's admirably descriptive 'Fruit Manual,' a new and enlarged edition of which is now greatly needed, has been of great value to planters of fruit. Mr Barron's 'Vines and Vine Culture' is still a standard work. As for Mr Rivers, apart from his writings, he brought out more new varieties of fruit of commercial value than any other man in his generation. Before

writing the comprehensive and valuable guide to fruit-growers named at the head of this article, published in sumptuous style, with admirable coloured illustrations by Miss May Rivers and numerous explanatory drawings by Mr Worthington G. Smith and Mr George Shayler, Mr Wright had gained the prize given by the Company of Fruiterers in 1889, for a practically instructive essay on 'Profitable Fruit-growing,' which has passed through many editions, teaching thousands of persons how to select, plant, cultivate, and prune fruit-trees to the best advantage.

Without any pretence of naming half the writers who have helped to render the movement under notice extensive and successful, the list must still be slightly extended. The late Mr Shirley Hibberd did much good by exposing the evils of the system of severe pruning which prevailed in his day as the only recognised alternative to the total neglect of pruning in established orchards, although it must be admitted that he carried his advocacy of the extension system to an extreme. Mr Simpson, among the more modern authors named at the head of this article, is another advocate of the extension system, which, in moderation, is also recommended by Mr T. W. Sanders, Mr Cheal, and Mr L. H. Bailey in their instructive manuals. With respect to the encyclopædic work known to a past generation as 'Thompson's Gardener's Assistant,' the new edition, under the able direction of Mr William Watson, helped by his well selected staff of specialists, has been greatly improved and expanded in all its sections, and in none more than in those relating to fruit-growing, to which a large portion of the second volume is devoted. Mr R. Lewis Castle, whose valuable essay on the packing and marketing of fruit and vegetables gained the prize of the Company of Fruiterers, has contributed some of the most instructive of the sections.

The Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm was established in 1894 by the present Duke of Bedford, with Mr Spencer U. Pickering as scientific adviser and Mr R. Lewis Castle as manager; and many interesting experiments, calculated to throw light upon doubtful questions in fruit-culture, were started. Two reports, giving the observed results of many trials, have preceded the one recently put

in circulation—an exhaustive account of a particularly important test, to which we propose to recur.

The preceding remarks will suffice to give some idea of the wealth of information that has been spread throughout the country during the last twenty years, tending to promote and direct the expansion of fruit-growing on successful lines. Unfortunately, the statistics of fruit-growing contained in the Agricultural Returns are neither complete nor explicit enough to afford an accurate conception of the progress of the industry. For reasons that will be given presently, comprehensive statistics are hardly procurable; but, by means of a little trouble in classification, they might be rendered more satisfactory than they are at present. In one respect the statistics are misleading, namely, in relation to the increase of the area under fruit; for, down to 1890, they were obtained from all holdings of a quarter of an acre or more, whereas, since that year, the returns have been collected only from occupations over one acre in extent. As fruit has been planted on a great number of very small holdings, it is clear that the increase has been much greater than appears from the Agricultural Returns. But this is not the only missing item of increase; for fruit has been planted also to a large extent in recent years in new orchards attached to private residences, which never have been, and could not well be, covered by the Agricultural Returns. The total area under fruit, then, is, as it always has been, much greater than the statistics make it; and the increase in recent years has also been greater than is indicated by a comparison of the figures of various dates.

Moreover, the statistics, as at present arranged, display a partial overlapping of figures. Although 'orchards' and 'small fruit' are returned separately, the former, when they contain top and bottom fruit, are enumerated under both headings. 'Orchards' are plantations of fruit-trees; and if there is grass under the trees, their area, besides being stated separately, is included under the heading of permanent pasture; while, if there are fruit-bushes or strawberries under the trees, their area is stated both under 'orchards' and 'small fruit.' It is impossible, therefore, to ascertain the total area under fruit; but this inconvenience might be easily

avoided. If those who fill in returns of small fruit were instructed to state the acreage grown alone and under trees separately, the enumeration might be arranged under three heads: orchard trees alone, top and bottom fruit, and small fruit alone; thus preventing any overlapping.

Again, there is reason to suspect that many fruit-growers do not properly understand the brief directions in the schedules, and that much of the top and bottom fruit is returned either under 'orchards' or under 'small fruit' alone. Otherwise, it is impossible to account for the comparatively small increases shown during the last few years, which are inconsistent with observations, and with the great sales of trees and bushes from nurseries. In spite of deficiencies, however, the figures show considerable increase.

The acreage of orchards in Great Britain was first given in the Agricultural Returns for 1871, and then—as was subsequently admitted—inaccurately. The first year for which the figures are entitled to any degree of confidence is 1873; and that year will here be taken as the starting one. Small fruit was not enumerated until 1888. The latest return under either heading is for 1902; and in the following abstract the figures for orchards are compared for 1873, 1888, and 1902, those for small fruit being compared for the last two of the three periods.

ORCHARDS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

—	1873.	1888.	1902.	Increase or Decrease.	
				1873-88.	1888-1902.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
England. . . .	113,295	194,040	230,673	+50,745	+36,633
Wales	3,052	3,357	3,767	+305	+410
Scotland . . .	1,874	1,781	2,416	-93	+635
Great Britain . .	148,221	199,178	236,856	+50,957	+37,678

While the increase in Great Britain in the fifteen years ending with 1888 was 50,957 acres, the expansion

OUR ORCHARDS AND FRUIT-GARDENS 385

in the fourteen years ending with 1902 is represented as 37,678 acres. The latter increase is unexpectedly small; and the statement leads to the suspicion that the introduction of the inquiry as to small fruit somehow confused the returns as to orchards. This is rendered all the more probable by the fact that a decrease was shown in each of the three main divisions of Great Britain between 1887 and 1888.

SMALL FRUIT IN GREAT BRITAIN.*

—	1888.	1902.	Increase.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
England	32,776	68,263	35,487
Wales.	532	1,203	671
Scotland	3,416	5,912	2,496
Great Britain	36,724	75,378	38,654

Here the total is represented as having been more than doubled in fourteen years, which is quite in accordance with the observations of those who are familiar with the principal fruit-districts of the country.

Most remarkable is the general incidence of the expansion under orchards and small fruit respectively, throughout England, as shown in the table on the following page.

In only one county is a decrease under orchards represented as having taken place between 1873 and 1888, namely, in Northumberland; and only two contractions appear between 1888 and 1902, namely, in Durham and Staffordshire. It will be noticed that Kent has now the greatest area of orchards, although that county was far below such great cider counties as Devon, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, and Somerset, in 1873, and far below three of them in 1888. The considerable extensions of orchard area in Devon, Herefordshire, Somerset, and Worcester-

* Since this article was in type the preliminary summary of the Agricultural Returns has been issued, giving the area under small fruit for Great Britain as a whole, but not separately for its main divisions. The total for 1903 is 76,152 acres, or 774 acres more than for 1902.

386 OUR ORCHARDS AND FRUIT-GARDENS

ORCHARDS AND SMALL FRUIT IN ENGLAND.

Counties.	Orchards.			Small Fruit.	
	1873.	1888.	1902.	1888.	1902.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Bedford	323	681	1,048	80	383
Berks	1,005	2,270	2,762	126	387
Bucks	1,544	2,373	3,558	206	618
Cambs	990	2,315	3,402	1,441	3,876
Chester	1,820	1,941	2,320	1,008	1,661
Cornwall	4,057	5,100	5,307	716	1,677
Cumberland . . .	239	319	433	97	284
Derby	745	1,005	1,071	223	604
Devon	24,448	26,485	27,177	803	1,371
Dorset	3,339	4,265	4,440	63	122
Durham	126	283	270	199	333
Essex	1,046	1,545	2,598	519	2,065
Gloucester	11,620	16,169	20,174	1,042	1,520
Hants	1,110	1,750	2,122	746	2,378
Hereford	21,373	26,269	27,072	175	679
Herts	1,102	1,298	1,795	245	542
Hunts	356	532	756	185	446
Kent	10,161	17,114	27,638	12,344	22,495
Lancaster	2,343	2,451	3,212	1,360	1,956
Leicester	565	972	1,252	300	471
Lincoln	1,152	1,872	2,535	750	1,660
London & Middlesex }	2,622	3,750	5,129	2,649	4,623
Monmouth	2,420	3,888	4,027	54	186
Norfolk	1,304	2,158	3,448	883	3,629
Northampton . . .	560	772	1,046	167	363
Northumberland . .	355	122	174	326	593
Nottingham	1,364	1,916	2,342	480	936
Oxford	830	1,692	2,046	49	229
Rutland	42	76	88	35	44
Salop	2,593	3,900	4,770	131	242
Somerset	18,192	23,787	24,894	288	573
Stafford	860	1,251	1,211	113	281
Suffolk	1,119	1,620	2,011	333	711
Surrey	1,676	2,293	2,650	674	1,272
Sussex	1,569	2,482	3,306	483	1,259
Warwick	849	1,736	2,705	253	535
Westmoreland . . .	143	336	417	30	58
Wilts	2,164	3,271	3,773	102	168
Worcester	12,706	18,658	21,786	1,360	4,063
York	2,373	3,323	3,908	1,720	2,970

shire, although these counties are all large producers of cider apples, may be assumed to consist almost entirely of fruit for market in its raw state. Worcestershire is well known as the most important of all counties for plums; while Herefordshire and Somerset are producers of some of the finest apples and pears. In the production of small fruit, Kent, from time immemorial, has been far ahead of

any other county, growing about one third of the total for England. An increase large or small, however, is shown for every county.

Wales and Scotland are of comparatively slight importance as fruit-producing countries. In Ireland there is no return of orchards, which occupy very little space; and it is only since 1899 that the acreage of small fruit has appeared in the agricultural statistics of that country. In that year the return was 4809 acres, which area was reduced to 4359 acres in 1900 and to 4309 acres in 1902. Probably the totals cover all the large private fruit-gardens of the country; and their accuracy is at least questionable, as a movement in favour of the production of fruit in Ireland has been in progress for two years or more, so that the apparent decrease is probably the result of corrected inaccuracies.

In the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands the return of orchards has risen from 1271 acres in 1888 to 1697 acres in 1902, and that of small fruit from 217 to 698 acres.

Without allowing for orchards and small fruit outside the area covered by the Agricultural Returns, it may be asserted with confidence that our production of marketable fruit has increased by more than 100 per cent. since 1873. The area under small fruit has more than doubled since 1888, and probably it has quadrupled since the earlier year; and, although the orchard area, according to the official statistics, has increased by barely 60 per cent., the increase is probably all in market fruit, and the new plantations are composed of varieties much more prolific than those of the old orchards. The quality is also better; and the manuring, cultivation, pruning, thinning, picking, and packing of tree fruit have been greatly improved, so that there is a larger proportion of saleable fruit, with less waste, than there was formerly.

There is no doubt that the chief obstacle to fruit-planting has been the lack of security to tenants who were disposed to plant. In the case of planting fruit-trees, it is best to purchase the land upon which the enterprise is to be carried out; but it is often difficult, even for a man who possesses sufficient capital, to obtain a small farm suitable in all respects for the purpose, with due regard to situation near a market or a railway, soil, and

aspect. Moreover, many a tenant who desires to continue his occupancy of a farm would gladly plant a portion of it with fruit, if fairly secured in respect of the large outlay necessary before any profit can be expected. A transferable lease of fourteen years would be sufficient security for the planting of small fruit-bushes or plants, which soon come into profit, and would be nearly worn out by the end of that period. Such a lease, however, cannot always be obtained; and a much longer one would be necessary to warrant the planting of trees which do not repay the cost of attending to them for from six to ten years.

The Agricultural Holdings Acts are inoperative in relation to fruit-planting, except with the consent of the landlord, which is very seldom given, because it would involve him in the liability of having to pay an indefinitely large sum in the event of the death or quittance of his tenant. When the Act of 1900 was under discussion, Parliament rejected even the modest provision allowing a tenant to plant one acre of orchard, with a right to compensation, without his landlord's consent. Until the Market Gardener's Compensation Act of 1895 was passed, the tenant who planted fruit without the written consent of his landlord had no legal protection for a halfpenny of his outlay. That Act gives a right to compensation for fruit-planting to a tenant whose holding has been let to him as a market-garden, under a written agreement, since the 1st of January 1896. It was also intended by its author, and generally supposed, to secure compensation for planting done before its commencement where a holding was in use at that date as a market-garden, with the landlord's knowledge, and he had not given to the tenant a written notice of objection to the operation being performed; but the judges of a lower and a higher court, and the House of Lords in an appeal from their judgment, declared that the Act was not retrospective. Last session Colonel Long introduced a Bill as a substitute for the badly worded section rendered worthless by this judgment, distinctly making the Act retrospective to the extent of ten years before the commencement of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883; but it failed to obtain the attention of Parliament. At present, then, the law gives no protection to fruit-planting executed without the written

consent of the landlord before the beginning of 1896, or after that period, except with such written consent to specific improvements or to the holding being occupied as a market-garden. It is possible that some landlords will be less unwilling to let small farms as market-gardens at comparatively high rents than they have been to give their written consent to the planting of fruit by ordinary farm-tenants; but probably the great majority will decline to incur the heavy responsibility involved in such an arrangement.

For the purposes of the paper which he read last year before the members of the Surveyors' Institution, Mr C. H. Hooper made extensive inquiries as to the customs in relation to fruit-planting by tenants prevailing in different counties. Except in the Evesham district, he failed to discover any regular custom. In that district it has become customary to allow fruit-growers, on quitting their holdings, to sell their improvements to incoming tenants acceptable to the landlords. The arrangement appears to have worked satisfactorily, as the landlords' property has been substantially improved, and there is always ample security for moderately high rents; while the tenants obtain good prices for their improvements, as there are plenty of buyers in the district. The custom, however, is not old enough to have acquired the force of law; and its value rests entirely upon the goodwill and fairness of the owners of land. There is no law, except in the case of a holding let in writing as a market-garden, to prevent the landlord from turning a tenant out of a holding at the termination of his agreement, usually a yearly one, and confiscating the whole of the improvements made by him or paid for when he entered, or from appropriating a large proportion of the value by raising the rent to the occupying tenant or his successor. Of course, before the purchaser of the tenant-right agrees to the sum that he will pay, he must ascertain the rent that will be demanded; and any considerable advance would proportionately diminish the sum which he would pay the outgoing tenant. No attempt to wrong a tenant in either way has become known in the district. Rents have been raised moderately in some cases; but the give-and-take principle appears to have been applied amicably as a rule, if not invariably.

Elsewhere the varying arrangements are not, as a rule, calculated to encourage fruit-planting. Much of the planting in Kent, Mr Hooper says, has been done by tenants holding under long leases; and this, apart from the Evesham plan, is the most satisfactory arrangement that appears to be at all common. At all events it is so where the trees have been provided by the landlord—as they have been in some cases—the tenant doing all the work of preparing the land, planting, staking, and subsequent attention. A long lease, or compensation on quitting in the case of a yearly agreement, is obviously needed, even when the landlord provides the trees, which cost less than a fourth of the expenditure involved before a plantation yields a profit. In the case of a plantation of standard trees, without any small fruit between and under them, the tenant would incur an annual loss for about ten years; and even in the case of a plantation of top and bottom fruit there would usually be a loss, gradually diminishing, for from three to five years.

It is clear, then, that if a tenant is not to receive any compensation for fruit-planting on quitting his holding, he should have a lease of at least twenty-one years, even when the landlord supplies trees, if he is to enjoy a fair chance of recouping himself for some years of loss, and earning a fair reward besides for his enterprise. Yet Mr Hooper found that a much more common arrangement is one under which the landlord supplies trees to a yearly tenant, who incurs all the other expenses without any right to compensation. No doubt in such cases the tenants accept an obviously unsafe arrangement in full faith that they will receive honourable treatment by being allowed to enjoy their improvements long enough to reap advantage therefrom. Happily such faith is rarely abused on the great estates of this country; but the most honourable of landlords is not immortal, and, even though his successor may be equally fair in his policy, the tenant himself may die before his planting becomes profitable, and his family may be unable to carry on the farm so as to recover the loss incurred.

Less inequitable is the plan of reducing the rent for a few years after planting, the landlord providing the trees and raising the rent after the plantation comes into profit. Other arrangements, including some allowing the

tenant a small amount of compensation for planting if he quits the holding, are named by Mr Hooper; but no plan that is at all common throughout the country is calculated to induce a prudent tenant to venture on the enterprise.

When it is borne in mind that the letting value of land commonly rises by at least 5*l.* an acre a few years after it has been well planted with good stocks of fruit and properly manured and cultivated, it seems strange that the inducements commonly offered to tenants willing to plant should be so inadequate. It is satisfactory to learn that in several of the counties in which fruit-growing has increased recently, most of the growers have purchased the land which they have planted. This is by far the best plan to adopt, even when it is necessary to pay a somewhat high price for suitable land.

Each of the two comprehensive works named in the list at the head of this article gives full and explicit advice to the intending fruit-grower upon all essential points, from the selection of a site to the packing of the fruit for market. In these works, and in Mr Cheal's excellent handbook, there are also clear and ample instructions as to budding and grafting. Yet the novice will inevitably find that he has to purchase dearly some of the experience which will be of the greatest value to him in the course of his career. In giving advice in general terms it is impossible to allow for all the varying circumstances which may produce exceptions to a rule or qualify its application. It is also to be observed that nearly all works on fruit-growing contain directions which to the commercial grower are counsels of perfection, impracticable to him, although useful to the cultivator of a small private orchard, managed regardless of profit, with a view only to obtaining the best results. For example, with respect to site or soil, the man desiring to plant fruit may be constrained to make use of the spot on which he resides, if he plants at all. Again, a grower of fruit for market on an extensive scale usually has no time for the summer pruning or pinching so commonly recommended, as preliminary to the late autumn or winter pruning, while root-pruning on scores of acres is quite out of the question. The fact is that

nearly all the writers on the subject are, or have been, gardeners, accustomed to receive, and not to pay, wages; and the need of economising the heavy expense of labour has not been brought home to them. Fortunately, from the commercial grower's point of view, experiments at the Woburn Fruit Farm, so far as they have gone, tend to show that summer pruning is not necessary; while root-pruning is not called for where there is plenty of room to allow branch extension to balance root-growth. There is an opening for a thoroughly comprehensive work devoted exclusively to the subject of commercial fruit-growing.

Although all growers of fruit are not free to select their site, the choice of situation is the most important of all the points affecting financial success in fruit-growing. The character of the soil can be modified by draining, judicious manuring, and thorough cultivation, whereas the site, once chosen, is unalterable. Liability to damage by frost or by gales, aspect in reference to sun and the winds which are most likely to do injury, and distance from a good market or a railway, are considerations inherent to the selection of a site which are of the utmost importance. An ideal site is extremely difficult to obtain. In the first place, while a somewhat high altitude is desirable as a protection against frost, this usually involves exposure to wind, and there is seldom any alternative other than exposure to the cold and injurious blasts from the north or the east, or a free course for the violent gales from the south-west. A site of sufficient altitude, open to the south or south-east, protected from wind from other directions by higher land, and near to a good market or a railway station is rarely open to the would-be buyer.

As altitude is fixed, while wind can be checked by shelter-trees and fences, exposure to the latter, if not from the north or north-east, must often be tolerated as a necessary evil, sheltering arrangements being made, if possible, in advance of fruit-planting. Mr Bailey, who has made a special study of wind-breaks, gives a great deal of valuable advice on the subject in his 'Principles of Fruit-growing'; and it is noticeable that he warns planters against excessive sheltering as tending to the multiplication of injurious insects, and, by rendering the

air comparatively stagnant, increasing the liability to damage from frost.

With respect to nearness to a good market, it is to be observed that the best openings for the extension of fruit plantations are in the neighbourhood of large towns not well supplied with fruit at present. The cost of railway carriage for a long distance is a serious drawback to the returns of the fruit-grower; and when, in addition, there is the expense of carting some miles to a railway station, he is seriously handicapped in his undertaking.

That regard to the most suitable soils for fruit has its due influence upon the minds of planters is seen by the pre-eminence, as a fruit-growing county, of Kent, where the various beds over the lower greensand cover large areas; of Devon, Herefordshire, Somerset, and parts of Gloucestershire, counties in which fertile loams over the old or new red sandstone are remarkably suitable to the production of apples and pears; and of the Evesham and Pershore districts of Worcestershire, where the deep loams on the lower lias suit the plum to perfection. The somewhat extensive fruit districts of Cambridge and Sussex are, like those of Kent, mostly on greensand soils, in which all kinds of fruit flourish.

The selector of a place for a new venture in fruit-growing, however, cannot always reconcile the claims of situation with those of soil; and, fortunately, most kinds of fruit can be grown fairly, in a climate not too bleak, on any moderately deep soil that is neither a stiff clay nor a dry sand or gravel. Perhaps the texture of a soil is even more important than its constituents, as any deficiency in the latter can be remedied by manuring, while it is much more difficult to ameliorate the former sufficiently when it is strikingly faulty. Mr Hall, in his book on 'The Soil,' has a great deal to say on this point which deserves the attention of fruit-planters. It is of the utmost importance to fruit-trees and bushes to possess the advantage of a soil which, while it allows water to percolate through it with moderate freedom, still retains a sufficient quantity to enable it to supply moisture to vegetation in periods of drought. This is of special importance to shallow-rooting bushes and apple-trees on the Paradise stock. With a top soil fairly retentive of moisture, the subsoil can hardly be too

porous, as is shown by the flourishing growth of fruit-trees and bushes in Kent over a ragstone subsoil. A wet and cold subsoil causes trees, when their roots penetrate to it, to produce a profusion of rank and unfruitful shoots, or renders them liable to become unhealthy from canker or some other disease.

There is need of careful consideration in the selection of the classes of fruit to plant most largely, and in the choice of varieties of each class. So far as general rules can be laid down, full and trustworthy advice is to be found in the first two works named at the head of this article. But, as the apple flourishes best in one district and the plum in another, while the pear and the cherry are especially fastidious in their requirements as to soil and climate, due regard should be paid to the results of attempts to grow any of these fruits in the district in which planting is to be carried out. Similarly, some varieties, particularly in the case of the apple, which flourish luxuriantly in one district or in a particular class of soil therein, fail to grow well in other districts or soils. It is of great importance, therefore, to ascertain which varieties succeed and which fail in any particular part of the country. The needed information cannot be fully acquired by the inspection of old orchards, because they do not contain some of the best varieties of the present day. Unless there are comparatively new plantations in the neighbourhood, a visit to the nearest nursery will afford the inquirer the best information on the subject available to him.

With respect to small fruits, the gooseberry will grow well enough wherever the apple or the plum flourishes. The raspberry needs a warm and friable soil, while the black-currant prefers a damp situation. Strawberries do best in a somewhat stiff calcareous loam, although they will grow fairly well in almost any soil that will withstand drought.

Probably the fruits that have proved most profitable on a large scale in the past are the plum and the gooseberry; but in seasons of abundance the markets are glutted with these fruits, and it is the opinion of some authorities that they have been planted too extensively. Many years ago, before the fields of raspberries and strawberries were greatly extended, these fruits often

brought in greater returns than any others; but the rise in wages and the fall in prices have materially reduced the profits of growers, the cost of picking being extremely heavy. Black-currants paid handsomely until the fatal mite invaded the plantations, many of which have been grubbed up in consequence of the destruction wrought by this most invincible of insect pests. No method of destroying it which will not also kill the bushes has yet been discovered; and, seeing that the mite during nearly the whole of its life is safely entrenched inside a bud, a defence against its attacks will not easily be found. As the black-currant is the only fruit that is decreasing in the extent of its cultivation, there is a common desire to plant it; but, unless mite-free bushes can be obtained, it would be folly to fulfil that desire. Even with such bushes to start with, they must be planted at a considerable distance from any infested plantation, and carefully inspected periodically, in order that any 'big buds' may be picked off and burnt as soon as they are observed.

The production of choice apples, when the trees are properly planted and attended to, and the fruit is well graded and packed, is fairly profitable; but apple-trees are much slower than plum-trees in coming into full bearing; and even a good apple crop seldom brings in as large a return as a correspondingly abundant plum crop, when the prices of both are near the average. The planter of standard apples has usually to wait eight or ten years for a remunerative return for his outlay, and in the meantime he incurs an annual loss. Dwarf trees of bush shape on the Paradise stock come into bearing much sooner than standards or half-standards on the crab or the free stock; but half-standards are usually preferred by extensive growers. Some varieties do best on one stock, and others on another. These preferences are known well enough by nurserymen; but what is but little known is the comparative suitability of the several stocks to different soils and subsoils.

Ample instructions for planting and pruning are given in nearly all books on fruit-culture; but, with respect to the latter operation, variations of practice under differing circumstances are necessary, and these can only be learnt by the exercise of the grower's observation and judgment,

Very little is known as to the most economical dressings of manure for the several varieties of fruit on various soils. Of course, farmyard manure may be safely applied, and applied liberally where trees or bushes are bearing freely; but the best constituents and proportions in mixtures of artificial manure have still to be ascertained by sustained experiments in different parts of the country.

The cost of labour in fruit-growing is extremely heavy, from the time of the preparation of the land, including its deep cultivation by steam or horse-power, or by hand-trenching, to that of the picking of the fruit. Planting, staking in the case of standard trees, the cultivation of the soil to destroy weeds, pruning, and spraying are all expensive operations, and all are absolutely necessary to success. The manager of one of the largest fruit plantations in the country declared publicly a short time ago that it costs 100*l.* to plant and attend to an acre of top and bottom fruit before it yields any profit over the expenditure upon it. Possibly the estimate is exaggerated; but other authorities have made similar statements.

There is no doubt that the greatest obstacle to success in fruit-growing in this country is the occurrence of frost in the spring. In the past season the plum, pear, and damson crops were almost entirely destroyed by frost, while the apple crop escaped only in favoured places, and cherries, gooseberries, currants, and strawberries were more or less injured. The damage is seldom so general; but almost invariably damage is done by frost to one or more of the kinds of fruit. It is questionable whether the depredations of birds or those of insects should be placed second in the list of adverse agencies. The former are difficult to prevent, whereas the latter are mitigated largely by spraying. Wild birds have increased so enormously since young boys, who were inveterate bird-nesters, were banished from farms by the Education Acts, that their destruction of fruit-buds and their consumption of ripe fruit have assumed very serious dimensions.

Birds are destroyers of insects, no doubt; and yet the injury done by the latter is apparently greater now than ever it was before. New or freshly observed insect enemies of the fruit-grower are constantly being brought to notice; and entomologists advise him to spray nearly all the year round, as if he had nothing else to do.

Truly, the fruit-grower's struggle against adverse influences is a strenuous one; and even when he has succeeded in obtaining a good crop, his returns are often sadly disappointing. Too commonly, moreover, he neglects his opportunity of getting the best prices by failing to grade and pack his produce properly. On these points Mr Castle's little handbook is an invaluable guide, the directions for packing being fully and clearly given, and elucidated by illustrations. For the benefit of small cultivators the author also gives specifications for the home construction of cheap packages in the winter evenings.

The charges and delays of railway companies are frequent causes of complaint on the part of fruit-growers. They are small disadvantages, however, in comparison with the costly and otherwise unsatisfactory system under which fruit is marketed. The difference between the prices paid by consumers and those received by producers is enormous. In the first place, the grower, who consigns his fruit to a salesman, never knows whether he receives what the latter makes of his produce, less the commission; and, secondly, the retail fruiterer requires so large a profit that his selling price is often double what the producer receives from the salesman. By charging inordinately high prices, the retailer reduces the demand for fruit, and thus produces an artificial glut in the markets. He prefers a large profit on a small sale to a small profit on a large sale; and he is able to secure the former by fixing his prices high, and at the same time to reduce the rates at which he buys by creating an artificial glut in the wholesale markets. The only remedy for this unsatisfactory state of affairs is co-operation among fruit-producers, of which there is no prospect at present.

There are many problems in relation to fruit-culture which stand in great need of elucidation; but hardly any systematic attempts have as yet been made to throw light upon them. The Royal Horticultural Society has not made any considerable efforts in this direction, and there are no state-aided horticultural institutions in this country corresponding to the agricultural colleges with their experimental farms. A few trials in the manuring

of fruit-trees are being carried out in a small plantation attached to the South-Eastern Agricultural College at Wye; and Dr Dyer and Mr Shrivell have recently begun, on a farm occupied by the latter in Kent, a few trials of a similar description. But the only experiments in fruit-culture carried out upon a considerable scale are those of the Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm, already mentioned as one of the educational features of the present time. The farm has now been established nine years; but the third report, recently issued, relates to only one of the important sets of experiments which are being carried on. The authors explain that, while their first and second reports, which embraced all their trials, were necessarily superficial owing to the incompleteness of the experiments, the data are now more numerous, and they find themselves able to deal more extensively with each subject. They consider it, therefore, advisable to issue reports more frequently than heretofore, each report dealing thoroughly with one or two subjects only.

The latest report relates solely to the effect of grass on fruit-trees—a very important subject. The experiments in relation to it are of an exhaustive character, and are described, with their results, in elaborate detail. It has long been known that fruit-trees planted in pastures do not grow as well in their early stages as trees planted in arable land, at any rate unless a space around each tree is kept cultivated. On the other hand, it has been declared by experienced growers that apple-trees, when mature, do better in pasture than elsewhere. Until the Woburn trials were made, however, no approach to precise knowledge had been attained as to the comparative growth of young trees in land under grass and in cultivated land respectively. The difference was found to be enormously in favour of the latter, very soon after the planting was done, although the grass was not sown until after the trees had been planted. Four years after the planting, when some of the trees were taken up and weighed, those in land under grass had increased by only about two thirds of their original weight, while trees of the same varieties and age, planted at the same time and grown close to them in land kept free from grass, were from ten to thirteen times their original weight. Even more remarkable is the statement that the roots of the

trees, nine years after planting, and twelve from the budding, show a still greater difference, so far as can be determined by their appearance; and most remarkable of all is the announcement that trees not grassed until they were eight or nine years old have suffered as much as the younger trees from the grass around them. Some comparative trials with grassed and badly planted and neglected trees have led to the conclusion

'that no ordinary form of ill-treatment—including even the combination of bad planting, growth of weeds, and total neglect—is so harmful to the trees as growing grass round them.'

It is admitted that, on some soils, the effect of the grass may be less injurious than it is on the Woburn soil; and that, after a time, trees may recover when their roots extend deeply enough to escape from the grass roots, since partial recovery has taken place at Woburn where the roots of grassed trees have extended laterally beyond the borders of the grass. As the subsoil there is a stiff clay, which the roots of even trees on the crab stock have not entered, they have not got beyond the influence of the grass roots, except laterally in some cases. As to the cause of the injurious effect of grass upon trees, the authors of the report give reasons for concluding that neither interference with the supply of water or air, nor contraction of the food-supply is the principal cause, but that

'the grass has some actively malignant effect on the tree, some action on it akin to that of direct poisoning.'

Unfortunately the necessity of extending the grass beyond its original area, in order to keep the extending roots of trees covered with it, has trenchd upon the ground devoted to some other experiments of great interest and importance. But this has not affected the important trials of different methods of pruning bush-trees on the Paradise stock, the results of which, down to 1900, were described in the second report. One leading nurseryman, who has some supporters, recommends the plan of leaving trees as they are for a year after planting them, instead of cutting them back at once as usual; but results at Woburn support the ordinary method.

Trees cut back after planting, and not subsequently pruned, have produced larger branches than those pruned moderately; but some varieties of them have grown irregularly, and it is clear that they would have been the better for moderate pruning. Those which were neither cut back after planting nor pruned subsequently are irregular in growth and badly shaped trees. Although they have produced more fruit than the pruned trees, it has been smaller; and the straggling branches have been weighed down by the fruit, and to some extent broken by wind. Moderate autumn pruning, without any summer shortening, shows very little if any difference from the results of what is styled the normal treatment, which consists of shortening the main branches in summer where necessary, and moderate autumn pruning. Summer pinching alone has produced thickets of growth; but summer pruning, done after the growth of shoots for the season was completed, gave normal results, as it was practically autumn pruning. Severe autumn pruning proved unsatisfactory. The only material difference between the experiments on dwarfs and standards respectively is that the late summer pruning mentioned above, while possibly beneficial to the former, was not so to the latter. On the whole, the normal treatment has proved the best.

Many fruit-growers are anxious to learn the latest results of different treatments of the surface soil in another of the trials. Down to 1890 there appears to have been no material difference in the growth of trees on ground beaten hard and not stirred in any way (the weeds being pulled out, to avoid hoeing) and that of trees grown on a plot dug two or three times in a year; but, where the weeds were allowed to grow unchecked, the trees have been nearly as much injured as those with grass grown over them. It is a pity that an experiment noticed on the farm in 1899 is not now in the programme presented to visitors. This was one in which one plot was dug and hoed, and another only scraped with a hoe. The trees, when seen, were as good on the latter plot as on the former. Most fruit-growers dig or fork their plantations in the winter, and hoe them in summer. The former operation is very costly; and, if it is not necessary, there would be a great saving in dispensing with it.

Another trial, the results of which are of great practi-

cal interest, relates to depth of cultivation preparatory to planting. It would be interesting to learn how the growth and fruiting of trees planted in land dug only one spit in depth compare with that of trees planted in land dug to the depth of one spit, and forked to an equal depth below. The relative effects of planting in mere holes of different depths, which are all considered bad in retentive soils, as drainage holes tending to accumulate water from the surface, would also excite interest, if reported. The same may be said of the numerous experiments in the manuring of different kinds of fruit, which, down to 1900, gave generally negative results.

The production of fruit under glass has increased during the last thirty years in a much larger proportion than production in the open. An inquiry made in 1899 in the principal glass-house districts of England led to the conclusion that, in the thirty years before that date, the area of commercial houses in England and Wales had risen from less than 100 acres to fully 1100 acres. In the Cheshunt district one nurseryman, who had started only seventeen years before, had 27 acres under glass in 1899; and his next-door neighbour had 24 acres covered. One of them, who was the first to start in the district, estimated that commercial houses had risen from zero to 125 acres since 1872. In many other districts round London also the increase has been enormous. At Worthing the area covered by glass, which in 1875 was less than 1 acre, had increased by 1899 to at least 50 acres. As there has been a large further increase during the last four years in many parts of the country, it is probable that about 1300 acres are under commercial glass-houses in England and Wales at the present time.

The quantity of produce grown on 1300 acres covered with glass, to say nothing of the area in Scotland, Ireland, and the small islands, is difficult to estimate; but, when it is borne in mind that most of the houses are heated, and that two or three crops are frequently grown in a year, it may be imagined that it is very large. Possibly one fourth of the houses may be devoted to flowers, and the rest mainly to grapes, peaches, nectarines, strawberries, tomatoes, and cucumbers. One grower near London is supposed to produce fully 320,000 lbs of

402 OUR ORCHARDS AND FRUIT-GARDENS

grapes, another at least 250,000 lbs, and a third about the same; while an immense quantity is produced at Worthing. The estimate made in 1899 for England and Wales was 9,408,000 lbs; and by this time the total is probably much over 10,000,000 lbs. Last year the Channel Islands contributed 2,800,000 lbs to our supply of grapes. This large output consists almost entirely of additions made within the last thirty years.

Tomatoes are usually ranked as vegetables, although they are really fruit, and to a great extent take the place of fruit, as proved by the fact that they fall in price when plums are in the market, and often recover partially afterwards. It is believed that the production of tomatoes in the United Kingdom is three times as much as that of grapes, whereas, thirty years ago, the quantity of tomatoes produced was insignificant. One nurseryman states that, about forty years ago, he knew only one market grower of tomatoes; and that man's crop of one ton proved too much for the London market. The Channel Islands sent us over 15,000,000 lbs of tomatoes last year.

Home competition in relation to most kinds of fruit has increased more considerably than foreign competition; and this is particularly the case in relation to hot-house produce. Therefore there is no need for the recommendation so frequently given to farmers to embark in fruit-growing. Under the existing system of marketing, which, as stated before, frequently causes artificial gluts, the increase in production is going on quite rapidly enough. When great crops of plums, apples, gooseberries, raspberries, or strawberries are grown, prices fall to a barely remunerative level; and in some seasons large quantities of plums, at least, have been left unpicked. Hot-house grapes, a luxury for the rich thirty years ago, have been brought within the reach of comparatively poor people at the periods of the year when they are most plentiful. Living growers can remember choice Muscats being sold at a guinea a pound early in the season, whereas they rarely reach 6s. now, and later in the year the most prolific varieties of hot-house grapes sell wholesale at less than 1s., and occasionally as low as 6d. per pound.

Our imports of out-door fruit vary almost as greatly as our home production, in accordance with seasons,

though there has been a general increase in the last ten years. In 1902 we imported 2,843,500 cwts of apples, or about 600,000 cwts more than we received from foreign and colonial sources ten years before; but in 1901 the quantity was only 1,830,200 cwts. When the United States and Canada have good crops, their produce is so cheap in this country that home growers cannot compete advantageously with the importers; and they aim chiefly at the production of fruit which is fit for market before the American and Canadian supplies arrive. Probably our market supplies of pears are more than half of foreign origin, as the yield is too uncertain in our climate to be much in favour with commercial growers. Foreign strawberries and cherries are mainly received before the home crops are ready, and the quantities are very small in comparison with the home production. With respect to plums, our imports of about 300,000 to 500,000 cwts are trifling as set against the great quantity grown in England in a prolific season. Imports of grapes, amounting in 1902 to over 70,000,000 lbs, seem enormous; but more than four fifths of these were out-door grapes from Spain and Portugal, which do not rank with hot-house produce, though they must affect the demand for it considerably. Our receipts of foreign grapes, indeed, have grown more steadily and largely than those of any other kind of fruit.

It is not so much of the quantities of imports of fruit of most kinds that home producers complain, as of the fact that supplies from some countries arrive before home produce is ripe, and take 'the cream off the market.' Choice English fruit, however, is the best in the world, and it usually commands a better price than imported fruit when both are in the market together. As a rule, foreign fruit is much better graded and packed than home produce; and native growers lose greatly by their carelessness in this respect. Their best prospect of success, in the face of increasing home and foreign supplies, lies in the production of choice varieties, and in careful attention to culture, thinning, grading, and packing, together with co-operation for the purposes of reducing the cost of transport and improving the system of marketing fruit.



Art. V.—THE 'TIME-SPIRIT' IN GERMAN LITERATURE

1. *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.* By Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Two vols. Munich: Brockhaus, 1903.
2. *Die Geistigen und Socialen Strömungen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.* By Theobald Ziegler. Berlin: Bondi, 1901.
3. *A History of German Literature.* By J. G. Robertson. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1902.
4. *Thus spake Zarathustra. The Dawn of Day.* By Fr. Nietzsche. Translated by A. Tille and Johanna Volz. London: Fisher Unwin, 1900-03.
5. *Die Serényi. Zwei verschiedene Geschichten.* By Otto Erich Hartleben. Berlin: Fischer, 1901.
6. *Über den Wassern. Drama in drei Akten.* By Georg Engel. Berlin, 1902.
7. *Jörn Uhl.* By Gustav Frenssen. Berlin: Grote, 1902.
8. *Das Tägliche Brot.* By C. Viebig. Berlin: Fontane, 1901.
9. *Aus der Triumphgasse.* By Riccarda Huch. Berlin, 1902.

And other works.

WHAT is the main idea that underlies the manifold intellectual movements culminating towards the close of the nineteenth century? Popular writers will always account for tendencies by instancing their pet particulars. We hear much of the strides of progress, the growth of democracy, the march of science, the emancipation of women and of thought, the spread of materialism. But their deeper understrain eludes the mob. The nineteenth century is the epilogue to the French Revolution and the prologue to the unknown. We would summarise its meaning by terming it a drama of the conflict between the principles of duties and of rights, of discipline and of impulse, of authority and of independence, of experience and of experiment, of naturalism and of spirituality.

In the domain of religion both unfettered intellect and unconfined emotion have warred with inspired infallibility. In politics, feudal and federal principles, imperial and cosmopolitan ideas, have tried conclusions. The French Revolution, indeed, published the charter o

inherent and irresponsible rights; and these have since grappled with every form of earned and responsible privilege. In science no bounds are set to the discovery of laws, which, after all, are themselves only recurrent but inexplicable facts. In art feeling has triumphed over judgment. In literature instinct has constantly clashed with idealism. In philosophy too Kant's postulate of duty has been more and more neglected. Throughout Europe, if we except our own country, which still inherits active traditions and organic institutions, together with the happy knack of compromise, the preceding century's later decades have divorced liberty and order, while they have witnessed an intermittent crusade against capital and against authority, against Jews and against kings. Nor has that crusade rested mainly on just indignation against greed and tyranny; it has often been their outcome, for it belongs to the revival of instinct which, since the French Revolution, has coloured every sphere of thought and action. Criticism again, the less convincing because the less condensed, in an age of universal diffusion and communication, has abounded. As Frere sings in a paraphrase of Aristophanes:—

'Each has got a little book
In the which they read and look,
Doing all their best endeavour
To be critical and clever.'

Creativeness has declined; for no human creator can succeed in chaos; and when the atmosphere is atomic, individuality shrinks into atoms also. The refuge of weakness in co-operation grows more and more manifest; the international flavour in every department more and more pronounced. This conflict is of course no modern product, though the peculiar conditions induced or enhanced by modern mastery over physical forces have stamped it with a distinctive character. Moreover, in Germany there has been added the struggle to attain united nationality. But the cleft between Hellenism and Hebraism, between the subjective and the objective outlooks, has never ceased to widen. The Stoic system founded by a Phœnician, the Epicurean, founded by an Athenian, emphasised it over two thousand years ago. The old Semitic ideal was one of individual relations to

the Eternal. Its higher aims eventually found expression in the purely Semitic concept of a spiritual church. The Greek and Roman ideals of personal happiness were brought into the common stock by their relation to the purely Aryan concept of an organic state. The state was their religion.

In the rough, then, the nineteenth century has witnessed many tendencies that weaken the faculty of government. And were England not an exception to the general bias for centralisation, did she not still find security in her instinct for local government, her national reconciliation of freedom with order, and of both with empire, she could scarcely herself have escaped the disturbances of the atmosphere. But side by side with these elements of disorder, sometimes in connexion, sometimes in collision with them, the tendency also of nationalities (as opposed to races) to assert themselves has distinguished the scene which has lately closed. Nationality has played as large a part during the nineteenth century as rebellion. Even in England the struggle has been evident. We have seen it in America, in Canada and our North American colonies; in Poland, in Italy, in Greece, in Schleswig-Holstein, in the Danubian principalities, in Hungary. In France the idea of nationality still appeals to the past and points to the future. In Germany that idea, which should replace the rivalry of races, has caused the most material change in European balance since the conquests of Napoleon, and is probably destined to effect other alterations as far-reaching.

Thus much we have dared to dilate, because the book that heads our list—great in size but great also in interest—avowedly deals with the foundations of the nineteenth century. Herr Chamberlain's imposing work, with the sound and fury of which Germany still tingles, is not what its title would suggest to English ears. It does not aim at doing for the nineteenth century what Lecky has done for Rationalism and European morals, what Buckle has done for civilisation. It is, in fact, on a far larger scale, one of those 'culture-histories' to which Germany has for years been accustomed. It seeks to show, with all the equipment of modern and 'higher' criticism, with lights, too, diffuse rather than intense, even with occasionally startling insight, the ideas that underlie

all the ancient systems of the East and of the West. Its double end is to prove the constant and ultimate superiority of the Indo-European mind, and the predominance of the 'Germanic race.' Of race as the fount of tendencies and systems, Herr Chamberlain says much. To the Greek he ascribes purely intellectual force alone; to the Roman the genius for empire, and the elevation of woman; to the Hebrew the inextinguishable power of arbitrary will; but to the Indo-European he attributes the deepest religious and loftiest practical endowments. Through Christianity, he urges, they met, and eventually clashed with, the imperial monopolies of Rome. Since then, he proceeds to argue, they have gradually emancipated themselves both from the egotism of Semitic religions and the self-centralisation of Latin politics. They have, he thinks, developed and raised, almost originated, the true ideals of Christianity, so much so as to demand new religious forms for their adequate expression. They have, he is also pleased to imagine, refreshed and emancipated art, humanised and elevated literature. Their prerogatives of expansion and civilisation are infinite. They are at once heirs of all the ages and the earnest of all that is to come.

When he proceeds, however, to 'nationality,' he starts a confusion of ideas that we shall notice later. He is so possessed by the idea of pure 'race' that he shuts his eyes to the vision of nationality, as, in fact, the antithesis of mere race. And it is very noticeable that throughout his lively learning there is an uneasy, almost aggressive protest of German nationality linked with his glorifications of the 'Germanic race.' It is this tone which weakens his ability to convince us in his main theses, much as he enlightens us by his details of illustration; while it is this tone again that, to our mind, renders his gigantic book grandiose rather than great. When we close the second of his huge volumes, with its bewildering forecast of future 'Germanity,' we cannot help surmising, from his temper quite as much as from his assertions, that German nationality is, after all, at present still in the crucible of process; that it is for the moment a cut-and-dried pattern in forced conformity to which the pedantry of Prussian officialism is striving to mould very diverse elements; and that therefore it is most unlikely to stamp

itself on art and literature. Despite names and constitutional formulas, German government is a government by the sword. The democratic drift of the 'Time-spirit' sends this 'Germanic nationality' partly into emotional revolt, partly into cosmopolitan exile; for nationality, if it is to be a source of ideal strength, must be harmonious, and can never be based on a war of races which its essential business ought surely to reconcile and to reform.

And yet a war of races is the very keynote of Herr Chamberlain's book. He reminds us of those German 'patriots' in 1848 who deemed a single drop of Slav, Bohemian, or Hebrew blood fatal to United Germany. That races were not in conflict under the later Roman Empire is so great a blemish in his eyes that he can only describe it as the 'chaos of peoples.' The individualism that he praises in Luther or Goethe is blamed in the Greek and the Jew; while he enunciates the astounding paradox that the greatest results of the Latin race were not due to great personalities but were inherently 'anonymous.' Can he forget that Augustus Cæsar, who has stamped the Roman idea on the world's imagination, was not only eminently a 'person,' but also as much an alien to the pure Latin race as Napoleon was to the pure Gallic?

Modern history Herr Chamberlain dates from the year 1200. It is a convenient signpost, for during the thirteenth century arose in force the Germanic conflict with papal Cæsarism, the Germanic popular movements in the guilds, the Germanic revolutionary movements in thought and religion, and many of the complex forces that still affect Germany and her literature. These embryonic elements, however, could not mature into modern existence until the invention of the printing-press occurred more than two centuries later. It was then only that European democracy may be said to have been born.

A Teuton of the Teutons in all but his name, Herr Chamberlain seems as positive and versatile as his sovereign. Like him he surveys 'all time and all existence.'

'He argues high, he argues low;
He also argues round about him.'

But his prejudices constantly outweigh even his erudition. We dissent from many of his complicated conclu-

sions, and much of his bewildering evidence; and we think that the pith of his polemic (for such it is) did not require over a thousand pages for its adequate expression. His two chief refrains are the apotheosis of the Germanic, and the indictment of the Semitic races. These aspects are obtruded at every step. The whole book is an Iliad of conflict between Aryan and Semitic tendencies. We shall show afterwards that his notions are perplexed by an initial and fundamental error. It will appear that the national idea depends far more on continued and assimilative association than on the bond of identical blood.

According to Herr Chamberlain, the Germanic includes all the northern races. Under it he reckons the Lombards, the Tuscans, and the Goths, as well as the Teuton, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Scandinavian. His ethnography is original. Dante, it seems, was a German. So were Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, and Galileo. According to him, all the great European individualities since the decline of the Roman Empire are Germanic. 'All is race,' he quotes with approval from Disraeli. His own addition to the theory is that there never was, will, or can be such a race as the Germanic. It is no fluid or passing factor, but a permanent and triumphant fact. Its genius for nationality will perfect the destinies of religion, culture, commerce, and monarchy. It will develop the majesty of laws (which it did not originate), of creeds (which it borrowed), and of (alien) arts. It is the fine flower of civilisation—pure amaranth; and it is made in Germany.

The Jews, on the other hand—much as he extols the distinctive nobility of the *Sephardim*—cherish racial and ineradicable instincts incompatible with the highest European tendencies. But Herr Chamberlain is no vulgar anti-Semite. Apart from the race problems which he unduly emphasises in considering nationality, he attaches the features which he blames in the Semite to myriads of non-Semites, whom he considers as steeped in Semitic traditions. He allows, on the other hand, that the Jews have produced great and characteristic ornaments of the Germanic peoples; but then these are 'humanised' Jews; and when a Semite is humanised he ceases, says Herr Chamberlain, to be a Semite. We should have expected

our author to have risen above the sophism which, in attacking a class, excepts all examples contradicting his generalisations. But his theory of race renders him even more inconsistent. The Jews, according to modern research, widely explored by Herr Chamberlain, were originally an amalgam of three races, Arabs, Amorites, and Hittites. When a Jew externally and internally is Arab or Amorite (for Amorites are Aryan), he is almost what Herr Chamberlain desires. It is the wicked and preponderant Hittite who mars it all. Surely this author should perceive that you cannot admit mixture in compounding race, and at the same time separate its elements for praise and blame. He avows the mixture equally in the Germanic race. If Dante's ancestry was German instead of Goth or Tuscan, with some Teuton admixture, as has been contended, then the late Professor Virchow, the living Paul Heyse, must be reckoned Jews. Yet Herr Chamberlain would not so reckon them. He dives, however, still deeper into confusion. Just as all modern genius is claimed as Germanic, even his immemorial glories are denied the Semite. St Paul, thinks Herr Chamberlain, was no pure Jew, because he sprang from a city where races were intermixed. His mother, he pleads almost with pathos, must have been Greek. The Virgin, he holds, was not a pure Jewess, because Galilee was riddled with Amorites—that very strain which, as we have seen, he claims as an original component of the race. Nay, the Saviour himself taught Aryan ideas. We confess that we fail to follow this logic of fanaticism. We are reminded of a true history. So late as the close of the eighteenth century Joseph I of Portugal decreed that all descendants of Jews should wear a yellow cap. His minister, Pombal, appeared in council with three yellow caps. 'One,' he replied to the king, 'is for your Majesty, one for the Grand Inquisitor, and one for myself.' We can imagine Herr Chamberlain's horror if he dreamed that one of these yellow caps might, after all, fit him in common with many other distinguished persons.

Herr Chamberlain gives intense will-power as the characteristic of the Semite. Goethe, so often cited by him, but here ignored, gives energy as the characteristic. Are will and energy racial endowments fatal to the nation of which the race forms part, and to its national

literature? And if not, why should the author—naturally irritated by much that may be *parvenu* and offensive—wax so fierce? Why, again, should he go out of his way to maintain that Spain degenerated through the Jewish infusion into Gothic blood, and that the ousting of the Germanic element completed her decay, which many of us attribute to the Inquisition?

The fact is, as we have already hinted, that Herr Chamberlain has missed the vital distinction between race and nationality. Later civilisation means little else than the replacement and absorption of distinct races by the national idea. Early ages saw simply an internecine warfare of races. Nationality has elevated mere races into individual and organic commonwealths. In all essentially corporate nations the mongrel element is far more to be dreaded in ideas than in races; and Herr Chamberlain has quite forgotten the many affinities, both religious and social, of the Jews to the countries they inhabit, nor has he dwelt on their strong sense of home—that very sense which modern and cosmopolitan literature so notably lacks. Their Protestant sympathies, too, have escaped him. Judæa itself was a 'Protestant Egypt,' a piece of the West in the East. He has omitted, also, the national power of a common language, by virtue of which America has blended races the most opposite. The Jews may well be left to defend their own. To stir up racial dislikes is not the way to cement the national idea, which depends on the fusion of reconcilables; and so our author may one day perhaps remember and act upon the refrain of Heine's Spanish ballad:—

'Lass die Mohren, lass die Juden.'

A race, whatever its origins, is an outward natural fact—the varying sap in the forest of mankind. A nation, on the other hand, is an inward artificial idea which combines congenial races into organic communities, and brings their specific forces into the common stock. Consanguinity is the seal of races, not of nations. There is no such thing as a nation of a single strain; and it was just because the theocracy of the ancient Israelites tried to form such a nation that it failed. The ultimate goal in the long process of time may still prove an international, or even a non-national community. The

Roman Church has ever upheld an imperial theocracy. But the strongest current of the nineteenth century has been the reassertion of nationality against cosmopolitanism, whether ecclesiastic or democratic. Can any one doubt that, broadly speaking, the English Reformation was a protest against the former, or that the French Revolution was in substance the anti-national protest of the latter? Romanism, revolutionism—these are the two alternatives against which the nineteenth century has been strenuous. Nationality is in truth ideal individuality; and so far individualism has withstood the surge of collectivism, while the wrestle between rights and duties is still raging. These considerations are essential if we would understand the basis of the nineteenth century. All tendencies hostile to individual influence and responsibility, all influences that merge personality in groups, or centre it in sacerdotal or military dictatorship, make for the abolition of the national idea. Thus much, indeed, is urged, with wide illustration, by Herr Chamberlain himself when he deals with the issues of Roman Christianity.

He deals, too, with much more than we have space to indicate. But his knowledge, though vast, is often second-hand, and even incorrect. He derives Mariolatry, for example, from Egypt, forgetful of the Collyridians, indigenous to Thrace, the cradle of the myths of Proserpine and Eurydice. Again, he emphasises only one aspect of religious development in Judæa, the late formalism of the Pharisees. He speaks of the 'law' as if it had been accepted as integral and permanent; nor does he distinguish dates and sects, or even mention the Essenes. Once more, when he vaunts that 'all kings are now Germans,' he forgets that monarchy and its emblem are both Oriental, that kings derive their crown from the East. Nor, perhaps, does he perceive that among these princes, if appropriateness were a principle, the Kaiser and the Czar might change thrones with advantage.

But we must pass from Herr Chamberlain's fancies to facts, and consider how the growing relaxation of acquiescence in the restrictions of authority, together with the growing aspirations after united nationality—the two

main distinctions, as we have seen, of the nineteenth century—have acted and reacted on German letters.

Germany has been a united nation some thirty years; and we should expect that her literature, so great in the past, her spontaneous expression, the sensitive mirror of her contemporary life, would have grown more and more national in its reflections. The reverse is the case. Since Prussia has absorbed Germany, we discern English and French influences (as was the case with Prussia in the eighteenth century), Russian, Danish, and Norwegian influence, but very little that is native at all. German literature, imbued with the indiscipline of the 'Time-spirit' instead of with the compactness of the federal-national idea, tends to be cosmopolitan, to lose its traditions, and to emphasise irresponsible personality or un-individual socialism; whereas, while Germany was split up into little states freely embodying different races, its literature was in the main intensely German with creative leaders and appreciative patrons. While the German nationality was an aspiration, it realised itself in literature. Now that it is a fact, its literary essence evaporates. Of many reasons for this anomaly we will instance three only.

Small states with cultivated societies and common ideas favour a unifying literature. It was so in mediæval Italy; it was so in ancient Greece. The break-up, again, of such parish-academies involves that of institutions; and institutions vanish the more speedily in the absence of political traditions. Now, it is on institutions rooted in the soil—such as Germany still possesses in her philosophy and her music—that literature thrives. But to thrive with creative force, literature must be fed by institutions translatable into action, and not by mere abstracts. Only one such institution—and that a non-traditional one—now predominates. Since 1870 the army has not been in action. Writers cannot kindle to order about an army that is not actively asserting the German nationality, or about an emperor who keeps rods in pickle for truant children. Such as do write to order on august themes produce a decent but uninspired literature. The more sincere and eager spirits betake themselves to the rebellious side of the 'Zeitgeist,' to its emphasis of individual rights rather than of national duties, to the 'woman

question,' the 'labour question,' to the 'problem'; and we are regaled with whiffs from every dish on the *table d'hôte* of the Grand Hôtel de l'Europe.

Again, the cementing under military rule of antagonistic groups (two of them even republican in their original forms) can scarcely occur without some deep understrains of discontent. Such discontent becomes deepened and heightened at a time when the cry for material comfort from the hand-workers of Europe coincides alike with immensely increased means of communication and a considerable decay of the religious spirit; and, in a country where philosophy is indigenous, it is further aggravated by the minor key of modern philosophy, which, as we shall see, has proved one of desponding bitterness. Literature thrives on optimism. Did all Germany share Herr Chamberlain's invincible hopes for the irresistibility of the Germanic race, then surely the literature of United Germany would be hopeful in the extreme. But that cheerful idealism which transmitted such priceless benefits to our own literature in the past has yielded to at best a chafing pessimism. The largeness of the national idea has not yet imparted to German literature that buoyancy which is usually associated with it.

By the dawn of the nineteenth century Goethe had intellectually united Germany. He was a nationalising force. While Napoleon was cosmopolitanising Europe, Goethe Germanised Hellenism. He gave all the German-speaking peoples method, aim, and voice. He rendered their philosophy in terms of life; he realised their emotions in poetry. He forced them to look outward and to criticise themselves. He founded modern Germany. But the strange and interesting back-current of the Romantic school, with all its disordered and distorted medley of ideas, continued to thwart his classical aims, though its special and intenser influences gradually faded away. The Romantic school began as Germany's reaction against Voltaire; it became a Gothic renaissance; after subserving the dreams of national union, it subsided into pure fantasy. It is impossible to comprehend German literature without comprehending the Romantic school. Through all its defacements and defeats, it represents the ineradicable German mysticism, still defying the 'Time-

spirit,' and lingering on in Hauptmann's dramas now that material naturalism has triumphed. Its emblem of the 'blue flower'*—that symbol of mystic longing, of mediæval moonlight, of death, of autumnal decay, of passive adoration of the past—could not, it is true, dam the torrent of wild ideas that flooded Europe after the French Revolution; but it hovered like irradiated dust across the sunlight and order which Goethe created out of that obscure chaos; and its mysticism became political because it was associated with a feudal past. Goethe himself has forcibly compared these knights of the moon to himself and his sister when they dressed themselves up as acolytes in nursery theatricals. The Romantics were players at historical sentiment. Their fleshly lives constantly belied their spiritual aspirations. Their yearning, their vague wistfulness, their Gothic fondness for myth and symbol were real; but their chivalry proved a charade. The whole movement was mimetic, some of it even hysterical; it was a form of that decadence which ever affects the primitive, because it loves the strong simplicity and fervent faith which its drifting weakness is incompetent to realise. 'Oui,' writes Madame Tinayre, in her recent and remarkable romance, 'il y avait des artistes qui se disaient "mystiques"; c'étaient des chevaliers du Graal, des âmes de Cygne, des Rose-Croix.' She calls them rightly 'prétendus catholiques.'

The romantic moonlight shimmered over ruins; and its votaries gloated over ghosts. One by one the Romantics either went mad, committed suicide, or found an ultimate asylum in Romanism. Something of the same movement in England assumed a characteristically different shape. Scott's novels, with all their 'buff-jerkin' business, were thoroughly wholesome aids to national unity. The 'Young England movement,' as embodied in the two greatest of Disraeli's novels, and in the less familiar fantasies of Lord Strangford, proved, and still remains, an active and optimistic source of national regeneration. But German romanticism was anæmic. Its air was languid, and it languished. 'Vain people,' says Nietzsche, 'value the past more highly as soon as they are able to reproduce it

* Throughout the works of Novalis and his compeers this mystical blossom stands for the longing of the soul to be free from the body.

(especially if this be difficult); nay, they wish, if possible, to raise it from the dead . . . perhaps the whole romantic movement is best understood from this point of view.' With exceptions, and despite much noble aspiration, it was essentially unwholesome. 'By classical,' exclaimed Goethe, 'I mean the healthy; by romantic, the sickly.'

And yet the Romantic school imaginatively harboured that national ideal which Goethe had sought to accomplish intellectually. They were powerless to achieve the Holy Roman Empire, but their influence propagated the *Volkslied*. While Goethe's cold statues of the Pantheon disdained the warm blood of political activity, the pale spirits of knight and troubadour became with the Romantics ghostly missionaries of patriotism and of faith. The Revolution of 1830 followed. 'Young Germany' strove practically for social and political union, and, though it combated the retrograde side of romanticism and harped on the future, it was born with a romantic tinge. Heine, the psalmist of modern feeling, rightly called himself an 'unfroked Romantic.' He transplanted their 'blue flower' to modern soil and enchanted it with modern moonlight. He fertilised it. He wedded new liberalism to old romanticism with ironical benedictions. For Germany loves mysticism and emotion; and mysticism, in Goethe's words, is 'the scholastic of the heart, the dialectic of feeling.' To the mystical the Romantics, with their passion for allegory, added the mythical, so that during the first three decades of the century the myth too pervaded German fiction. It still haunts the new developments of German drama. Germany will never quite dispense with her tobacco-smoke of sentimental mysticism either in literature or politics, in metaphysics or theology; though in the last the mythical school, which exploded an unreasonable rationalism, has itself become a myth. Romanticism too, we must admit, owned its healthier side, of which the simple and earnest Swabians were the chief exponents. While Von Arnim and Fouqué were dreaming away the present in the past, Kerner and Mayer, above all Uhland and Mörike, dedicated their fancy to the living world. By making wonderland, as it were, a workaday motive, they stripped it of its wonder; and from this period dates the cessation of that tragedy which depends on doubt.

But meanwhile another Swabian, not a Romantic but a sceptic, heralded a fresh formative influence deeply affecting Germany and her literature, which makes 1835 a more revolutionary date than 1830 or 1848, pregnant as both were with literary changes. David Strauss caused a religious upheaval. Hegel claimed to have reconciled religion and reason. Christianity, for him, meant the realisation of the divine inherent in the human. But, for him, mere facts were nothing; the main idea was everything. Strauss, on the contrary, pinned himself to the facts; and, with his Swabian inheritance of the myth, strove to make Christianity mythical. Neither the philosopher nor the sceptic recognised that divine personality acting on human emotion is the real spell of religion; that religion itself, as Herr Chamberlain well expresses it, 'is not a learning, but a life.' The one deified man, the other only reduced religion to an allegory, and, in refining away a literal creed, failed to substitute any spiritual summons.

It proved as barren as the French worship of humanity—Comtism. Is humanity a legitimate abstraction at all? Are not the grades and differences of races endless? The resolve, on the other hand, to deny all you cannot touch is, in truth, only a definition of reason—the poor yard-measure of what we can perceive. Reason's last advance is now to recognise the countless things that are beyond it; and, in Pascal's words, 'there is nothing so conformable to reason as that which it disallows.' The felt, the unperceivable, the eternal, the believable—these are, to our mind, the instinctive magnets of religion. Men need to make reason religious, far more than to make religion reasonable. Well, Feuerbach followed with his exalted materialism—'Man is what he eats' ('Man ist was er isst'). In his view man created God after his own image. And so Germany, sick of the past, baffled by the present, grew content to theorise about the future. She has always been freer and more forward in thought than in action. From 1835 to 1838 a mass of political and social theory pervaded her literature. The social-democratic ideal awoke—one, be it noted, at variance with the national ideal, which never ceased to germinate. Germany turned ruminative, chewing the cud of abstraction and 'inner self-consciousness'; while

her fiction began to rid itself of political feverishness; the romance with a purpose ('Tendenz-Roman') grew rarer. This did not, however, happen in a stroke.

Young Germany was still at work on the field of political literature. Heine and Börne wielded literature as weapons in a campaign. Nor had romanticism wholly expired; Ranke, the historian, is reckoned of its brotherhood. Menzel even hailed in Christian romanticism the national idea, and protested against Goethe's pagan legacy of 'universalism.' The problem whether the coming nation was to adopt liberal or romantic ideas still simmered in literature. So late as 1849 Bettina von Arnim's '*Das Buch gehört dem König*' sought to reconcile romanticism to Young Germany; and, on the social plane, long before, Schlegel, the virtuoso of the Romantics, had raised the 'new-woman' problem in his '*Lucinde*.' In 1835, too, appeared Goethe's correspondence with Bettina, which made Börne exclaim, 'After forty years Mignon has revived.' Much of that feminine strain, now audible in hysterics, began to pervade literature. The whole romantic movement was very feminine, and not least so in its refrain of regrets. Lost happiness is the pet theme of Lenau's exquisite elegies, though Lenau himself tried to find it in North America, only, like so many of the late Romantics, to die insane.

German fiction in the thirties still resembled a nerve-hospital; and so, by reaction, it gradually subsided into one form or another of realism. What it needed was rest; and Auerbach was among the first to bestow it. He restored narrative to natural quiet and fresh air. He gave fiction a convalescent home. In the midst of a 'witches' sabbath' of ideas, of pining 'nationalism,' of theoretic 'emancipation,' of democratic theories, of tendencies, both romantic and Romanist, he soothed the popular ferment by his idylls of '*Joseph in the Snow*' and '*Village Chronicles*.' Auerbach (like Mendelssohn) is a standing refutation of Herr Chamberlain's hobby. Could any Semite have proved more genuinely German? His gentle simplicity, philosophic dreaminess, and high ideals captured his public. His admiration for Spinoza, which produced his shortest and perhaps most fascinating novel, was due fully as much to his friendship with Strauss as to any racial prepossession. In Spinoza he per-

ceived an antidote to the pro-Romanising Romantics, in Spinozism a plea for the 'Free German Church' which he advocated. While radical doctrinaires were consciously or unconsciously retarding the national spirit, Auerbach breathed nationality with the still, small voice of home. Auerbach, too, was the first German to realise the German village. Keller and F. Meyer, who followed, were Swiss.

We have said that the age of so-called realism now opens on German prose. Beginning with the country, it spread to the towns, there not untouched by French influence. It belongs to a time before militarism was rampant, while the *bourgeoisie* was powerful and contented, and the working classes had not yet been saturated with the leaven of Lassalle and Karl Marx. It differs materially from the neurotic hysteria which now often usurps its name. The term 'realism' is far too loosely employed. Goethe long ago contrasted 'actuality' with 'realism' in a memorable passage of the 'Sprüche in Prosa.' All art is representation. Representation copies actuality. Actuality, however, is twofold, inward and outward. Common life is the sphere of realism. But modern realism is intent on outward actuality alone. It is in truth a method, not an end; and when, as now, it is often mere mechanism, a living picture of statistics; or, worse, when it rakes in gutters for refuse to photograph, or superficialises the dissecting-room, it ceases to be realism in any true sense at all, and becomes merely automatic. For the ideal is everywhere, and only seeks representation. 'Even mud,' again says Goethe, 'will glitter if the sun happens to shine.' But a copy of mud in motion under the glare of limelight is little else than dirt. The better distinction is that between naturalism and spiritualism, between the schools of matter and of soul. A return to instinct unfortunately marks the present literature of Germany; and realism, falsely so-called, is but a debased form of naturalism. In Shakespeare's phrase, 'They draw but what they see, know not the heart.' That this was not the realism of German fiction from 1848 to 1870 is to its honour. Coloured by the utilitarian outlook, it rather resembled our own Trollope, and 'the teacup and saucer' or 'mahogany' heyday. Though it obtruded some philosophy, and lacked the humour of our English master, it, too, tried to render the little

sympathies and ironies, sometimes with a purpose, sometimes without. It was genre-painting, doubtless, but it was neither unwholesome nor shallow.

One great drawback of psychological influence on modern literature is the craving for nerve-excitement in morbid self-analysis. Our modern heroes and heroines are always gazing at the looking-glass, and their creators rack their brains for emotional dilemmas. Common life is never commonplace when illuminated by intellects like those of Thackeray and of Trollope, of Miss Austen and Miss Ferrier. But the inward tortures even of Hamlet would sink to insignificance under the touch of some of our finickin later novelists; and Lady Macbeth, under the wand of our new dramatists, would probably reappear as 'The Worst Woman in Scotland.' 'In life surely man is not always as monstrously busy as he appears to be in novels and romances,' very sensibly remarked the young Disraeli in 'Vivian Grey.' 'We are not always in action, not always making speeches, or making money, or making war, or making love.' Still less are we always peering at and gloating over the grimaces of sentiment with a scrutiny that affects to be painful but is really a pleasure. In fiction, philosophy should be a leaven, not the lump. It works best when implied and suggested. With Germany, however, this did not long remain the case. Fiction soon reverted to the old German form of romance with a purpose. But its machinery had changed. Science had already affected the novel with psychology.

Gutzkow, in the preface to his 'Knights of the Holy Ghost,' had predicted this new era for romance. The old romance, he says, had been one of sequence in narrative; the new was to prove one of relations in character. Freytag, who followed with this idea, started in the early fifties with the confessed experiment of 'seeking the people at their work'—an aim which the *saloniste* Countess of Hahn-Hahn and her parodist, Fanny Lewald, had both missed. In Germany it was a new departure. Freytag's 'Soll und Haben' threw the necessity of labour into sharp relief by contrasting the mercantile capacities of a young aristocrat with the narrowness of merchants born. The book is prosy, but powerful. He worked the same vein till, in 1870, he began a forced labour of ancestor-worship. His 'Ahnenn' is a long cycle of national

means, better but not more fruitful than their successors. Dahn and Ebers are rather academic antiquaries than historical novelists. 'Cambyzes' (Ebers begins one of his chapters) 'passed a sleepless night.' His own books, interesting as they are in detail, might have cured Cambyzes; and Cambyzes himself remains as remote from us as ever. We have mentioned the Countess of Hahn-Hahn. It was she of whom Heine said that 'most authoresses have one eye on their paper and the other on the window, except the Countess, and she has only one eye.' Her drawing-room romances championed the 'emancipation' of the immense souls of lady aristocrats and their birthright of passion long before Sudermann did the same. She was a Catholic too, like so many of the Munich school. Such, also, was Scheffel, the student-poet, who believed that the secret of national salvation lay in the interdependence of duty-respecting classes.

'Each is, where he stands, a pillar
Built to prop the whole: but never
Will the shake of mutual ruin,
Blending in destruction, profit.
Wist ye what from such arises?
Men with universal piece-work
Dowered, but nought of whole completion;
Smooth, unmeaning, vacant mongrels,
Waverers from their soil uprooted.'

Here again the conflict between romanticism and naturalism, between duties and rights, between order and emancipation, reasserts itself.

Goethe's classicism, the mediævalism of the Romantics—these were on the side of national authority and order; Strauss's scepticism, the socialism of Lassalle, were a cosmopolitan leaven of distemper. Spielhagen, still among us, has always been popular. He was called a 'socialist of the salons.' He inaugurated the newer form of 'problem-novel.' But *his* problems have not been such as obscure the obvious. Those of capital and labour engrossed him, as lately they have engrossed Hauptmann. His books are perhaps more receptive than original, and he is fonder of types than of characters. But he has escaped the taint of the Romantics. He is never a pessimist, and so he managed also to escape that other pessimist influ-

ence—an influence vital in itself, yet from the early fifties so devitalising for German literature. We allude to the genius of Schopenhauer, which, with unexampled brilliance, has fought against every form of individuality.

Schopenhauer's lively dislike of life was metaphysical. In Germany it has, unfortunately, permeated the region of physics; and, joined to the newer aspects of science (especially as regards heredity), it has aided the novel of wretchedness and the drama of despair, the Slav religion of mere human suffering. The veteran Paul Heyse remains a standing protest against it, and claims a brief mention here. He is above all things a plastic artist. He regards life with refined curiosity. He remains a spectator. Something of that Italy which is never far from his thoughts is ever in his books. He is a spirit of the Renaissance. Culture, elegance, and style, distinguish him. Yet he never withdraws from the world of newspapers around us. He collects and inspects the specimens of its market-place as a connoisseur. With less concentration but with real affinities, the late Lord Lytton is his English counterpart. Nor can two other popular authors be omitted, Theodor Storm and Theodor Fontane. They are contrasts. Both were types of their homes; Storm, like Meuter, of Schleswig; Fontane of Brandenburg. Storm, in his many short stories, whether of the present or the past, was always a Romantic. In one of them he handles a pet theme of the school—the 'Doppelgänger'; in the most famous, 'Renate,' a witch is the *leitmotif*. His gaze is riveted on the past of peoples as of individuals; and a suggestive wistfulness is his undertone. He was a lyric poet, which Fontane certainly was not. Storm's feeling was romantic, his method realistic; the personal element of his style expresses the one, its shortness and directness the other. But Fontane was realist to the core, and not an original realist. He caught, and caught easily, the light realism of the new French school, then in the ascendant, but since supplanted by the newer realism of low passions and high society.

Of the formative influences on literary thought in Germany, we have hitherto singled out Goethe, the Romantics, Young Germany, and Strauss. Schopenhauer and Nietzsche remain, before we approach the

moderns. It is no exaggeration to say that Schopenhauer's influence has changed German literature, and that its last phase is almost the temporary undoing of Goethe. Reactions against pessimism are more dangerous than those against optimism; and none has proved more so than the rebellion of Nietzsche. And here we can test one of Herr Chamberlain's theories. The unmodified working of the Indo-European mind can nowhere be more strikingly watched than in Schopenhauer's pessimism. His whole philosophy is based on Buddhism—on the extinction of suffering by the extinction of will. If a substitute for Semitic religion is a real requisite for the 'Germanic race,' in Schopenhauer's doctrines it should surely be found. Yet observe its influence through Wagner on Nietzsche. Nietzsche in his earlier moods (for with him thoughts became passions) was in complete thralldom to Schopenhauer and his musical disciple, Wagner. Both Schopenhauer and Wagner have had a neurotic influence on literature. Wagner, although personal disappointment and national hope alike mingled with the poet's revolutionary fervour, was himself a blend of romanticism and Schopenhauerism, of the Gothic 'blue flower' and of the Indian Nirvana. As he grew successful he fell more and more in love with night and death. The ghosts of symbolic mysticism and of prostrate belief haunted him in an atmosphere of spirituo-sensuousness, suicidal quietude, and passive pantheism.

'To the sea of enchantment,
Its billows that throng;
To the perfume that circles
The summons of song;
To the whirlwind, the breath of
The world to belong,
And wavering down
In their tumult to drown—
Ah! this, nought but this,
Is ineffable bliss.'

Nietzsche went Wagner's way till his latent madness developed. On a sudden he renounced Wagner and all his works, to discover salvation in his 'Übermensch' or transcendent man. After discarding the religion which dedicates will to God, he revolted into one which sets no limits to human will at all.

The quintessence of irresponsible individualism—what is this, if we reflect, but Rousseauism revived, the return to Nature, in a nineteenth century disguise? In his own words, when refuting Rousseau, 'let paradox fight against paradox.' Rousseau's naturalism was sentimental, but Nietzsche's is a physical relapse into exaggerated and unlimited instinct. For Nature is really no millennium, but anarchy and barbarism, the harking back to primeval chaos. 'How can a person feel as a revelation his own opinion on things?' exclaimed Nietzsche. And again, 'Body creates spirit': 'God is dead; he hath died of pity for man': 'No good, no bad, but my taste, for which I have neither shame nor concealment': 'Far too many are born. For the superfluous the State was invented.' These are the war-cries of anarchy; and though his ideas concern the future, though his 'man' is 'a bridge, not a goal,' and 'Love hath the most remote future; man is higher than love for your neighbour,' yet in exalting self as the offspring 'of a mighty soul,' in belittling sympathy, and in loosing the shackles of social self-restraint, it is to anarchy that Nietzsche provokes.

He is after all only the prophet of naturalism as opposed to spiritualism. The pagan races are instinctively naturalist. The Gothic race, however, offered a *tabula rasa* early impressed by Semitic spirituality, involved in native shapes of natural symbols. So it fared, too, with the German Romantic school, which united the naturalism of Schelling to the spiritualism of Novalis. Nietzsche, however, means the revolt back into bare passion.* But in modern times such a revolt involves one against society. Nietzsche's 'over-man' is really the glorified brute. Race, instinct, rights—these are correlative ideas, just as nationality, discipline, duties are correlatives. And yet to say merely this would be superficial and unfair. Nietzsche rightly detested the humanitarian twaddle, and the flimsy conventions of barren culture—the 'poppy-head virtues' of his parlance. He discerned, moreover, that the flat plain of utilitarianism dispenses with the perspective of the 'noble,' which he contrasts with the 'good.' 'Noble' for him, as for Carlyle, meant practical power, force in swing. Like Carlyle, too, he thought

* Cf. 'The Dawn of Day,' p. 343, and 'Zarathustra,' *passim*.

that 'once spirit was God, then it became man, now it is becoming mob.'

Zarathustra had intended a religion for great men of forcible deeds. To compass a race of absolute heroes was Nietzsche's ideal; only that ideal seems on examination more violent than strong. Nietzsche really wants to abolish public opinion—the conscience of societies; 'to substitute new objects for this precious hereditary craving.' The suffering Nietzsche was himself a sickly Stoic. Hence his admiration for strength as an end in itself; hence his eventual contempt for 'the consumptive of soul who long for weakness and renunciation.' But, as Goethe has well said, 'mere naked instinct misbeseems a man,' and the 'over-man' is just mere naked, if gigantic, instinct; he is, in fact, radically anti-social; for society rests on interest cemented by duty, and duty is below the 'over-man.' Read Nietzsche's analysis of duty as based on 'Retaliation' in his late series of aphorisms, 'The Dawn of Day'—at length well translated; read again this sentence: 'If man would no longer think himself wicked, he would cease to be so'; and this taint becomes apparent. In one result he is, moreover, at one with his former masters. His recipe for those who are 'sick of their Ego' is 'plenty of sleep.' In one domain, however, Nietzsche is supreme, and that the most difficult for a German—style. For too many Germans it means the knack of sentences that die with difficulty. Since Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Heine, and Platen, the only great German stylists are Schopenhauer, Heyse, Nietzsche, and Sudermann.

We have endeavoured to show that the 'Time-spirit' in Germany has exhibited two principal, and often contrary, factors—the one tending towards social revolution, the other towards political nationality; and we have suggested that the elements of the former have too constantly leavened the expansion of the latter, and have in every department impaired both the will to obey and the capacity to govern. In German literature we have traced the progress of both tendencies. We have pointed out that Goethe's intellect united Germany by inward assimilation long before the practical effort for outward unity began to ripen. We have also hinted that the truly and permanently German mysticism of the Roman-

tics was more than a passive force, but that it was neutralised by the pessimist scepticism of later German philosophy, and has long ceased to be operative. We have shown that Schopenhauer's Indo-European passivity proved repugnant to any active shape of individual vitality, whether national or personal; and that Nietzsche's spasm of reaction implies a monstrous and mongrel anarchy of antediluvian giants. Has Germanic nationality, the fruit of the sword, succeeded in propagating really German influences in literature? Are Teuton mysticism, Teuton pieties, Teuton thoroughness and inner-consciousness quickened, and more masterfully expressed than heretofore? Has the centralisation of German government increased the power of discipline and intelligent obedience? Has union fostered sympathy? Has the foundation of the German Empire exalted and enlarged the simplicity of national aspirations? Is there now a strong national flavour in German literature? We shall see.

Germany, at any rate, has not escaped the European preference for the stage as a medium of ideas. Her finest writers are dramatists because the modern fever for quick results has found no antidote even in Germany. We shall find that the temper of her often powerful dramas is one less of hopefulness than of despair; that the individual will which they accentuate is one of insurrection against the necessity that controls it; that their cry is for personal as opposed to social equality, and therefore really makes for the reversal of social conditions, for social revolution; and further, that the idea of law which animates them is one of physical law, instead of that moral and spiritual law in the service of which alone lies human freedom. In a word, their whole tenour is one not distinctive of Germany, but scattered throughout Europe; while the dirge of suicide which haunts many of them re-echoes that pessimism, whether cynical or quietist, which disfigures an era at once clamorous for material comfort and yet penetrated by a passionate sympathy and an indefatigable research after truth.

The analysis that we have attempted of these main influences will enable us to rank Sudermann. He is no classicist, no sculptor of objects for their own sake. He is intensely subjective. His subjectivity is not that of

the Romantics; indeed it is directly opposed to it. He lives in, with, and for the present. He is absolutely outside the Christian standpoint. He is a refined materialist, a dramatic psychologist with a definite outlook; he holds a true mirror up to the 'Time-spirit' which he does not seek to modify. The half-sadness of his works, though neurotic, is never maudlin; he is no puling pessimist, though a pessimist in some respects he remains. Nor is he a cheap optimist. He believes that the game is well worth the candle, and that sincere, unflinching self-realisation transcends its price; nevertheless he has twice at least justified a voluntary exit from a scene where the individual is unsuccessful. Yet, in his hands, such exits are deliberate and dignified, with something of stoical self-reliance about them. He embodies without grossness, with insight, and even with genius, that free exaltation of feeling (or of nerves) above control and restraint, of the body above the soul, which we have from the outset indicated and followed. The constant theme of his plays is the struggle between individuals and institutions, between the seekers after happiness and its grudging monopolists. His almost invariable standpoint, except in 'Die Ehre,' is the feminine. It is the woman who suffers and triumphs through suffering of which man is a part; the man, indeed, is an accident even when he is not a misfortune. And once more, though all his plays concern 'problems,' his characters are never types. They are just as natural as if he had no purpose at all. The problem grows out of them, not they out of it. This last feature is, we think, partly due to Ibsen, who, with all his extravagances and errors, has certainly revolutionised the stage by creating a natural machinery to replace conventions and by originating a form of dialogue which, as it were, opens windows on the soul through its terse outbursts—a sort of psychological epigram. But Ibsen is often affected, Sudermann never. Zola's method is very different; his characters grow out of a social *milieu*. But his scenery of statistics also has undoubtedly influenced both Sudermann and Hauptmann, and emphasised their contrasts of toiling misery with luxurious corruption.

There are three refrains which recur in all Sudermann's works. The view of life which he perpetually repeats is that being is only realised through love between affinities.

Such love calls out the whole instinctive individuality. It brings suffering in its train; the affinities are often illusive. But it unfolds and fertilises the character; whereas the cold, mechanical, sometimes hypocritical formalities that sneer and condemn are themselves at once barren and sterilising.

This outlook is especially clear in 'Heimath,' where Magda grows to despise the man who has caused her fall, and yet works out her own independence through her motherhood. Her ruin is her deliverance. 'Home' means for her martinet father the Lares and Penates of unbending outward morality, the stern idols of the hearth; for the heroine it implies eager, affectionate self-reliance as opposed to the fetich-worship of authority; her vocation is her home; her home has ceased to be her vocation; and this is typical of a time when the sense of home is fast vanishing from literature. Her religion is her art and her child; for her smug, worldly-holy seducer, home signifies a sacrifice to propriety and prudence. She disdains the domestic notions both of the father whom she honours and of the lover whom she spurns.

'I don't reproach you' (thus she indignantly turns on him). 'Nay more, I'll explain why I am actually grateful to you. I was a silly, trustful creature enjoying its release like an escaped monkey. *You* made me a woman. All that I have attained in my art, all my personal capacities are due to *you*. My soul was like—well, in the cellar here, when I was a child, lay an old Æolian harp that was left to moulder, because my father could not bear its music. My soul used to be just such a cellared Æolian harp. Through you it was abandoned to the storm, and the storm has played on it to distraction—the whole gamut of sensations that transform us women into complete human beings—love, hate, hunger for revenge, thirst for renown, and want—want—want—thrice I repeat, want; and the highest, the hottest, the holiest feeling of all, the love of a mother for her child. I am your debtor for that also.'*

By a fine irony Magda, whose love is for persons, not for ideas or principles, is herself forced into the allegiance which she has renounced when she claims her

* This passage was translated by the author in an article, 'The New Drama' (Quarterly Review for October 1895), which contains a fuller analysis of the play.

child. But it is the passion of irresistible instinct to which she bows, not the authority of conscience. Here is no prodigal daughter, no returning penitent, like Olivia, but a woman who has battled and prevailed, not through the duty of self-surrender, but through the right of self-assertion.

Again, Sudermann, like Hauptmann and Hartleben, emphasises the tyranny of groups over stifled individuality. Magda is a protest against it: eminently so is Beate in 'The Toast of Life' ('Es Lebe das Leben'). Beate must certainly have studied Nietzsche. For her, causes, parties, ideas, mean simply the career of the strong man she has adored in strange association with the contentment of the weak husband she cherishes. Finely strung, she has craved a triple realisation of existence in her lover, her husband, and her child, which at once breaks and makes her. She has warmed every part of her being before the bonfire of life, and then, to save the three whom instinct endears, she must step out into the cold and the dark of death, for dark and cold it is to her. The utmost she can dream is just the beckoning of 'a vague bloom and gleam.'

'What is life for the majority?' she exclaims. 'Nothing but a little sound and fury signifying nothing. Individuality is crushed. What really lives? who truly dares to live? . . . We shudder and huddle together like felons.'

But she—she has lived her life to the full with nervous thrill outwearing a feeble frame. She is glad of it. She protests vehemently that she has not sinned or erred; she has been herself, and she raises her glass 'To life.' It is the old Epicurean euthanasia. She has drained the goblet and finished the feast. It is time to be gone.

The third strain on which Sudermann harps is that the present is haunted by the past. The thing that is hid shall be made light, and will war with destiny. It is not Nemesis, for it holds the same with good as with evil. It is not conscience, for it is visible law. It is rather retribution. 'Das rächt sich.' Things avenge themselves. Thus Sudermann's tragedies involve a determining past. The curtain rises after the storm and stress have vanished: the action developes their inevitable traces: the curtain falls on a final and fatal climax. And thus Sudermann

grudges us even the freedom of a canary in its cage. Our very fluttering beat against the bars is irresistible instinct. Instinct is both life and doom. And so, by a strange touch of extremes, that sense of destiny which inspired the Greek poets as a psychic force, and the Hebrew prophets as a moral law, pervades modern tragedy as a scientific formula. It is Calvinism transferred—the fatalism of physics. Sudermann refuses to realise that faith is no argument, but a gift; that none *can* believe but those who *will*. There is far less of volition and far more of fatalism in fiction than there used to be, just as there is much less of spontaneity in style and expression. The Christian liberty is ignored. The pagan chance has vanished. The very sense of adventure is rare. All is iron law; and licence of thought and attitude is but the bondmaid of necessity. Circumstance without, impulse within—these, in collision or union, dominate existence.

These cheerless excitements are, in truth, neither specially Sudermann's, nor native to Germany. They are cosmopolitan, that part of the 'Time-spirit' which has pitted individual independence against social and national interdependence. They run through the whole modern Slav and Scandinavian fiction; they have been popularised in France. In literature they are styled 'realism'; and they are the special province of the 'problem-realists,' who constantly invent nasty riddles without answering them. Sudermann does not follow them here; he is a higher realist, and has given supreme voice to these whispers of our starless night. We differ, therefore, from Mr Robertson's estimate, in his 'History of German Literature,' and believe that his work will endure, though we are tempted to ask if idealism has faded from our midst, and to wonder if these modern Antæi gain all the strength they imagine by continually retouching earth.

Hauptmann, too, is a fine dramatist. He depicts the social complexities of his time, and he idealises the sordid. He, too, belongs to the school of wretchedness. He cannot escape from the terrors of care and poverty, nor, on the other hand, can he escape from his innate romanticism; and hereby he proves himself more distinctively German than Sudermann. 'Die Versunkene Glocke' and 'Hänneles Himmelfahrt' might have emanated from the earlier Romantics. Of the former alone, in 1900, no less

than forty-four thousand copies were sold. Hauptmann aims at the reform of society. In the 'Biberpelz,' a kind of thieves' comedy, and in 'Der Rothe Hahn,' he analyses—as Sudermann does in 'Die Ehre'—the life of the artisan, and attacks the iron yoke of petty officialism, and that of the working classes over each other; while, in the former play, his choice of a 'humanised' Semite for hero rejects Herr Chamberlain's thesis. His style is less delicate and ironical than Sudermann's, but it is broader and more humorous. He is earnest. He displays great moral courage in his outlook, and none of that immoral courage which disfigures so many of his contemporaries. This is most noticeable in his treatment of the so-called 'sex problem,' which is one of the 'Time-spirit's' pet enigmas. Women's rights and wrongs have been prominently paraded by Dreyer in his 'In Behandlung,' by Halbe in his 'Mutter Erde,' by Rosmer in his 'Dämmerung.' Hauptmann has chosen the theme of divorce in his 'Friedenfest'; and his superiority can be tested by comparison with Hirschfeld's 'Agnes Jordan,' which deals with the same subject. In 'Die Weber' he brings into keen contrast the relations of capital and labour. 'Hänneles Himmelfahrt' may be called a modern mystery-play. It transfigures workaday life with all the fervour of ecstasy and all the poetry of symbolism. In this and in 'Die Versunkene Glocke' and 'Michael Kramer,' which concern artistic ideals, Hauptmann moves with greater ease, because the tide on which he swims is German. Here, at any rate, he is essentially a Teuton, and handles his material as it could be handled only by one who is at home.

Other writers, too, have treated quite recently of other subjects congenial to Germany. Education supplies the keynote to Dreyer's 'Probekandidat' and Ernst's 'Flachsmann als Erzieher,' as well as to Holländer's story, 'Der Weg von Thomas Truck'; while journalism (lightly treated of old in 'Die Journalisten') has found exposition in Ernst's 'Gerechtigkeit,' in Schönthan's 'Schwabenschlach,' and, above all, in the genial Schnitzler's 'Lebendige Stunden.' For the rest, we are no admirers of the sensational materialism of Hartleben's 'Rosen-Montag'—that Hartleben who has declined to the commonplace stories of his 'Serényi.' It is a tragedy of military

despotism, of passionate mutiny, of false honour and dastardly suicide. Sudermann's 'Fritzchen' is a far more poetical epitome of its theme. There is, however, a new and splendid play by a comparatively unknown dramatist. 'Über den Wassern,' by Engel, depicts the passion for self-sacrifice, and the self-sacrifice of passion, in a new setting full of force, interest, and expression. Suffice it here to say that the scene is laid in a desolate village daily threatened by the deluge of surrounding waters; that the action concerns the replacement of a good-natured but too easy-going pastor by a fierce fanatic for reform; and that the heroine is an untamed girl who resents his pious cruelties, but eventually sacrifices her life for his.

Of the immense crowd of German novelists, what can be said? They are the outcome of clever but often flashy journalism—'Ephemera, the tenth Muse.'

Jove's housekeeper that manages his matters,
Serves out his thunderbolts, arranges everything,
The constitutional laws and liberties,
Morals and manners, the marine department,
Freedom of speech, and threepence for the juries.'

She presides even over *belles-lettres*. Max Nordau, the brilliant arraigner of 'Degeneration,' is scarcely original. Most of his ideas are derived from others, and attest the truth of Goethe's saying that 'literature only degenerates as mankind itself grows more degenerate.' There are erotics like Nansen, railway writers like Perfall—the whirlpool that Paris pours into Berlin. But there is also a breezy reaction in the many depicitors of Alpine life. In his recent 'Hinkefuss,' Wichert has given us, in a fine village romance about a persecuted cripple, a picture of the freshness of nature marred by the brutality of man. But from out the mass of awkward adaptation and hysterical perversity two works of fiction emerge. They are both written by women, and they combine pathos with humour—a rare quality in a country where Raabe was reckoned as a humorist.

'Das Tägliche Brot,' by Clara Viebig, depicts with painful accuracy the gross temptations and sordid cares of servant life in Berlin, while through it all is heard the clarion of the Salvation Army. Like most German novels,

it is too long; but it is earnest and powerful. Hauptmann would have abridged the subject had he chosen it for drama: it shares his sense of conflict and of perplexity. In 'Aus der Triumphgasse,' by Riccarda Huch, we hail a work of genius. The scene is laid in an ancient quarter of a semi-Italian city, presumably Trieste. A young man of pleasure chances on a fortune, part of which consists in these mediæval houses, possessed by ghosts both of the past and the present, and inhabited by the very poor, pagan at heart though Catholic by profession. He comes, out of curiosity, to live among them, and stays from time to time out of a new sense of duty. He becomes acquainted with all their joys and sorrows; and tragically passionate these often are. We are shown, too, the fruitless play of theoretical philanthropy upon them. The charm of style and atmosphere are indescribable. The character of Farfalla, his chief tenant, shrewd, imperious, affectionate, and yet incurably cunning, is wonderful. She is a true daughter of the soil; and the milk of 'madre Natura' runs in her veins. In many respects she reminds us of that wonderful figure of Jacqueline, recently presented in Madame Tinayre's 'La Maison du Péché.' There is, too, another striking character—a lame boy, born to early death and pain, an idealist, a musician, without knowing that he is anything but a helpless, hopeless waif; and his melody haunts the romance like a refrain.

In 'Jörn Uhl' the pastor, Frenssen, has enchanted Germany. It is in truth a modern epic, but it is incurably long. It deals with the loves, hates, and vicissitudes of the yeoman-farmer in Friesland. The drab monotony of unchanged and ceaseless labour, the weird superstitions ineradicable from the soil, the fierce rage of outward, the turbulence of inward nature, are graphically conveyed. Jörn's own character would have pleased Carlyle. He is environed by the 'Silences,' and 'Eternities; but, truth to tell, of these eternities the inordinate length of the story is one. Not a single trait or incident is suffered to pass without some fresh legend or allusion, the one inside the other, as we see them in the Chinese puzzle-boxes. Moreover, Jörn himself is something of a 'Schlemihl.' But his relations with his world are so free and convincing, the whole atmosphere so bracing and pure, the tone so true

and original, that it stands out from the countless ruck of narratives where too often dirt strives with dullness.

Our last word shall be of Ernst von Wildenbruch. The author of 'Erasmus' Daughter' has, for some twenty years, been familiar as a writer of historical romances and patriotic plays—the very type of Hohenzollern adoration. Some three years ago he diverged from his track and gave to Germany a short and powerful masterpiece. 'Envy' ('Neid') is its name and its theme; it seems influenced by the method of Tolstoy; it is moving and spiritual; we only trust this author will continue to teach without preaching.

The contradictions of the 'Time-spirit' are disconcerting. Its very hopefulness verges on despair. It is all ebullition and emotion. It runs to seed as it runs to riot. Its passion for natural instinct and personal independence, its clamour for health, crumble into morbid and often hysterical waywardness. Its socialism wars against the higher type of nationality. Its freedom leads, as we have seen, to fatalism, its 'will' to wilfulness. Its petty cash of cleverness were well exchanged for larger and more striking coin. Its clamour for rights ignores the claim of duties. Its wider sympathies alone redeem it; and even these are constantly extravagant and neurotic. And in Germany is superadded at once the overwhelming need for expansion, and the rigid bar that militarism imposes. But it will change one day. For the supreme instinct of man is the craving for something above and beyond instinct. To realise that is true realism; and amid the problems that engross literature, 'Who is my neighbour?' stands higher than 'Who is my affinity?' Sooner or later it will be felt that the magnetic power of man is mightier than the electric swirl of nature. Man is no machine. He 'is born to adore and to obey.' It is only, perhaps, when science ceases to be narrowed in the popular mind to that fraction of it which is concentrated on material discoveries and inventions, and when people cease 'to dabble in stocks and call it progress,' that these truths will be generally re-acclaimed. With a more spiritual sense, reverence will return; and in literature, if we reflect, the decay of humour has much in common with the decay of reverence.

We have surveyed the action of the 'Time-spirit' in Germany. We have seen how little of German literature is traceable to the earlier influences of the nineteenth century, how little responds to the newly compacted nationality, how much is due to the fever for excitement, the strain of competition with other nations, the replacement of will by mood and of doubt by indifference, which an age of incessant haste and intercommunication implies. This, we may hope, will not last. The herd will cease to follow 'movements,' and will find leaders. Those leaders will find expression. The greatness of past German literature will revive. A great nation demands, and sooner or later will bring forth, great men. But neither the 'over-men' of Nietzsche nor the rebellious atoms of Sudermann are heroic. The heroes requisite must be truly national—men glad to bear the burden of their generation on their own shoulders, instead of shifting it on to those of heredity or posterity, souls who will teach Germany to realise her completeness.

'Immer strebe zum Ganzen, und kannst du selber kein Ganzes
Werden, als dienendes Glied schliess' an ein Ganzes dich an.'

This is the higher optimism; that which made the great Frederick exclaim, 'Mon devoir est mon Dieu suprême'; that which inspired the splendid vision of Milton foreseeing the national inspiration of unshackled literature.

WALTER SICHEL.

Art. VI.—POPE LEO XIII AND HIS SUCCESSOR.*

It is but seldom that the passing of an earthly potentate calls forth so nearly unanimous a tribute of respect and esteem as that paid to the late Pope Leo XIII by the public press of this country. With a few notable exceptions, the most authoritative of our English journals appear to have vied with each other in lavishing upon the late Pope what can only be described as a flood of eulogy; and assuredly the long annals of the papacy afford no previous example of a deceased pontiff being followed to the grave by a chorus of approval such as that amidst which Leo XIII was laid to rest in his temporary tomb in the Vatican Basilica.

In the preceding number of the Quarterly Review we endeavoured briefly to summarise certain of the more salient features of the remarkable pontificate which has recently passed into the domain of history. We disclaimed any intention of criticising Pope Leo XIII in his sacred office as supreme head of the Latin Church, confining ourselves, so far as possible, to a brief review of his political and diplomatic action. We ventured, in the course of our survey of the policy of Leo XIII, to express the opinion that statecraft rather than statesmanship was the moving spirit of that policy.

The events immediately following the death of the late Pope do not appear to us to render necessary any modification of this view. The careful observer of public opinion will, we think, scarcely have failed to detect a certain note of exaggeration in the panegyrics on Leo XIII that appeared in the columns of most English organs at the time of his death. It is worthy of remark that the moderate journals, both Conservative and Liberal, of Catholic countries such as Austria, Spain, France, Italy, and Belgium, which might be supposed to be at least as well informed upon the political aspects of the late pontificate, by no means shared in the somewhat sentimental, and perhaps, in certain instances, not altogether genuine eulogies so freely lavished on the papal policy by their Protestant English colleagues.

* For authorities see article on Pope Leo XIII in the Quarterly Review, No. 395, July 1903.

We believe, now that the state of mental excitement into which the journalistic world was plunged by the death of Pope Leo XIII has subsided, that few impartial observers will refuse to attach proper weight to the suggestive events which immediately followed that occurrence. It will be recollected that, so soon as it became apparent that nothing but a miracle could bring about the Pope's recovery, one hope was earnestly expressed in every country, Catholic as well as Protestant, namely, that the choice of the Sacred College, shortly to be assembled in Conclave, might fall upon a cardinal who should be a spiritual rather than a political pope. The nations, it is now obvious, had become not a little wearied of the ceaseless political intrigues which, for five-and-twenty years, had emanated from the acute and imperious mind of the head of the Roman Church; and, even among the most zealous adherents to the temporal pretensions of the Vatican, there were not wanting many who viewed with ever-growing distrust the insatiable political ambition of the deceased pontiff. It can hardly be doubted that, had it not been for a distrust which admiration for the marvellous intellectual powers of a nonagenarian Pope alone prevented from developing into openly expressed dissatisfaction, the vote of the majority in the Conclave would have been given to Cardinal Rampolla; and it may be safely assumed that the late Secretary of State was made the scapegoat for the political indiscretions of the master whom he had so long and so loyally served.

We believe that when the history of the first Conclave of the twentieth century comes to be examined from an impartial point of view, the figure of Cardinal Rampolla will stand out as the strongest and most dignified among the chief actors in the scene. For years the ex-Secretary of State had been content faithfully to execute the commands of Pope Leo XIII, fully aware that, whenever these commands led to failure, he would be supposed by the outside world to have inspired them. We suspect that few ministers of state have borne the burden of their sovereign master's political errors more loyally or with more chivalrous devotion than Cardinal Rampolla del Tindaro. None of those who have been brought into contact with his Eminence will be likely to doubt that

he possesses the ambitions which could scarcely be lacking to so brilliant and vigorous an individuality; and few, we venture to think, will refuse to admit that, when the highest of earthly dignities appeared to be within his grasp, he met defeat *en grand seigneur*, as only strong natures can meet it.

In the first portion of this article we commented upon Pope Leo XIII's policy towards Germany and France, and pointed to the fact that comparative success in the former country had been more than counterbalanced by complete failure in the latter. It has been repeatedly asserted that the friendly attitude suddenly assumed by Leo XIII towards the French Republic was the direct result of Cardinal Rampolla's influence; and it is worthy of note that the more the failure of that policy became apparent, the greater was the insistence in the Ultramontane press that the Cardinal-Secretary of State and not the Pope was the true author of it. It is possible, however, that, were Cardinal Rampolla at liberty to speak, he could point to other influences far more weighty than his own which determined Leo XIII to do all in his power to conciliate the government of the Republic. It may be remembered that the results immediately visible of Pope Leo XIII's abrupt overtures to French republicanism were the rapid multiplication of so-called religious congregations in France; the development of a carefully organised system of clerical journalism; and a corresponding absorption of large sums of money which flowed from the pockets of the lower classes in the provinces into the coffers of the religious orders. Although the French government cannot be altogether absolved from the reproach of having in some instances sacrificed the true interests of religion and charity to the clamour of fanatical anti-clericalism, nevertheless its action as a whole has been but the inevitable and necessary consequence of the political, financial, and social abuses fostered by institutions which, in many cases, were religious in little more than name and outward profession. We believe that Leo XIII, in the course of his long pontificate, submitted to no influence in foreign policy save that of his own will; and we have the very best authority for suggesting that neither his Eminence Cardinal Rampolla nor any other individ-

was ever permitted to oppose his pleasure with impunity. That the late Pope allowed himself to be swayed by certain material considerations is a fact well known to all who had opportunities of studying his character; and we do not doubt that these influences, and not the supposed anti-Italian and anti-German sentiments of Cardinal Rampolla, were chiefly responsible for more than one of his political failures. We shall, however, have occasion to refer to this subject hereafter.

The policy adopted by Pope Leo XIII towards the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was one of the most tortuous ever embarked upon by a responsible statesman. It may briefly be described, at least so far as regards Hungary, as a Slavophil policy. It is not easy to see at a first glance why the Vatican should have gone out of its way to support the national movements of the various non-German races which are included in the heterogeneous Austrian Empire. In the first place, a very large proportion of these races are outside the pale of the Roman communion; whereas the German element in the Empire is almost solid in its adherence to Roman Catholicism. Accordingly, it might have been supposed that the Vatican would have been loth to afford even partial support to any movement which might tend to weaken German, and therefore Catholic, supremacy in the Austro-Hungarian state.

Two motives seem to have dictated the apparently inconsistent policy of Pope Leo XIII. Our readers may recollect that, in the preceding portion of this review, we pointed out how, in one of his first encyclicals, Leo XIII turned towards the Eastern Churches, thus revealing an item of that mighty and far-reaching political programme which it was his dream to carry to a successful issue. Ever mindful of his scheme to reunite the two great Churches of the East and the West, and fearful of the influence possessed by the Orthodox Greek Church over the Slav races, there can be no doubt that Leo XIII hoped, by lending his countenance to Slav aspirations, to increase the influence of the Vatican and to further his ideal of bringing the Eastern Churches under the spiritual domination of the papacy. We believe, however, that this was only a secondary motive for the Austro-

Hungarian policy of Leo XIII. To understand the ultimate scope of this policy we must look beyond the Alps into Italy, and northward again to Berlin.

In furthering the revolutionary movements of the non-German elements in the Austrian Empire, Pope Leo XIII undoubtedly believed that he had found a weapon with which to assail the Triple Alliance and deal a heavy blow at United Italy. The entry of a Catholic Empire into alliance with the Italian monarchy has been, perhaps, the greatest disillusion which the Vatican has been compelled to suffer since the wresting of Rome from the temporal jurisdiction of the Popes. It would appear that Pope Leo XIII was not averse from the experiment of indirectly fomenting the internal troubles and dissensions of Austria in order that the necessity of ensuring domestic peace might ultimately compel the Austro-Hungarian government to renounce its foreign obligations. Despite every effort, however, and notwithstanding the devotion of the Imperial House to the Holy See and to the Pope individually, the failure of Leo XIII to induce the Austrian government to withdraw from the Triple Alliance was conspicuous. Austrian statesmen had the good sense to recognise that however desirable it might prove to be in the next world to have lived on good terms with the Vatican, the friendship and support of Italy were of more immediate and tangible advantage, especially with the ever present danger of a conflagration in the Balkan provinces and possible misunderstandings with Russia in consequence.

The Slavophil policy of Pope Leo XIII has been particularly apparent in the kingdom of Hungary, a large percentage of the population of which is Protestant and a considerable proportion Jewish. The interference of the Vatican in Hungarian affairs began so early as the year 1886, when civil marriages and lay education were condemned in strong terms by the Pope. In 1893 appeared the encyclical '*Constanti Hungarorum*,' in which these natural rights of a free people were again denounced. The attitude towards civil marriage and divorce adopted by the Roman Catholic clergy, acting under orders from the Vatican, had led to such frequent abuses of religious liberty, and such undesirable complications in the cases of 'mixed' marriages, that the

Wekerle ministry found itself compelled to introduce Bills in the Parliament in order to impose some limit on the action of the Roman Catholic clergy and some check upon their intolerance. Leo XIII spared no effort to raise an organised obstruction to these Bills on the part of the Catholic deputies; and for some time a struggle raged, in the course of which the popularity of the Emperor-King was not a little diminished in the eyes of his Hungarian subjects by the assertions of the clerical party that his Majesty was strongly opposed to the action of the government. This struggle, strangely enough, appears to have passed almost unnoticed by the European Press. Nevertheless, the result was an absolute defeat for the Vatican. The majority of Hungarian Catholics showed themselves to be as independent as their Protestant fellow-subjects, and as little disposed to tolerate the interference of Rome with their civil and domestic liberties. The papal Nuncio, the present Cardinal Agliardi, made his position untenable by his indiscreet attitude towards the Hungarian government, and the Pope was compelled to recall him; while, so strong was the feeling against the action of the Vatican, that the minister for foreign affairs, Count Kalnoky, who was suspected of attempting to prevent the Nuncio's recall, was obliged to resign his portfolio.

The Hungarian situation is one of the many difficult problems which Leo XIII, in his passion for political aggrandisement, has left to his successor to solve or to abandon as insoluble. The *modus operandi* adopted by Leo XIII in his Hungarian policy was identical with that followed in Germany, France, Italy, and Belgium. Antisemitism and clericalism were encouraged to combine their forces for the formation of a compact popular party which should determine the balance of power in the national Parliament, and should in time become sufficiently influential to bring about the repeal of all laws tending to liberty in religious and educational matters.

Notwithstanding the crushing defeat sustained at the commencement of his Hungarian campaign, the tactics employed by the late Pope appear to have met with more success in Hungary than in the rest of the Austrian Empire. There is reason to believe that the Ultramontane party has made considerable progress since the

days when Monsignor Agliardi was obliged to return to Rome. It appears, however, that this progress is scarcely likely to be durable, in view of the increasing strength of the Socialist groups and the indications of a return, under Count Banffy, to a policy of independence which the Socialist leaders would most probably feel it to be to the advantage of their party to support against a common enemy.

We look in vain for any tangible or lasting fruits of the policy adopted by Pope Leo XIII towards Austria-Hungary. If, as seems probable, the primary objects of that policy were to detach the empire-kingdom from the Triple Alliance, with a view to weakening the position of Italy, and to advance the prospects of reunion between the Latin and Greek communions on the terms of the Vatican, it must be admitted that such a policy has been barren of results. It has, it is true, afforded to thoughtful observers the anomalous spectacle of the head of the greatest conservative institution in the world deliberately lending his moral and social influence to encourage within a Catholic state revolutionary aspirations which, even if only partially realised, appear to tend infallibly towards the disintegration of that state and its collapse at no very distant period as one of the great European Powers.

Notwithstanding the panegyrics on the statesmanship of Pope Leo XIII which have appeared since his decease, we venture to maintain the opinion we expressed in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*, namely, that the policy of the late pontiff was almost invariably an opportunist policy; and that, while beyond question it succeeded in gaining for Vaticanism both prestige and a remarkable increase of local political influence, it is doubtful whether its victories were not in many instances obtained at a sacrifice of the true interests of Catholicism, and, we may add, of the internal peace and well-being of those countries to which it was applied.

In Austria the power of political ecclesiasticism has undoubtedly increased in a very large degree since the year 1878; but, unless we are to regard the abstention of the Emperor from returning in Rome the visit paid to him by King Victor Emmanuel in Vienna as a spiritual victory for the Roman Church, we are unable to see what advantages Catholicism has gained from the fact. Nor

does the Vatican appear to have realised more tangible profits. The Triple Alliance has been renewed; Italy, under her able and, if the term may be permitted, democratic young sovereign, is more prosperous than she has ever been since her unification; and there are no signs of any disposition on the part of the Orthodox churches to submit to the claims of papal supremacy, due acknowledgment of which could alone bring about the union dreamed of by Leo XIII.

In the meantime, if the Vatican has gained little or nothing by its opportunist policy, Austria suffers; as any state divided against itself must suffer. The struggle between Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism for supremacy in the Austrian Empire will have to be fought out. But, putting all spiritual considerations aside, it remains to be proved whether the late head of the Roman Church was not playing somewhat recklessly with the peace of Europe in the near future, when, in order to punish the Austrian government for having joined the Triple Alliance, and possibly also through fear of the attraction which Orthodoxy might exercise over Catholic Slavs should the Vatican discourage their revolutionary movements, he embarked upon his Slavophil policy. There is probably no statesman in Europe who could say with any certainty what even the immediate future of the Austrian Empire may be. It must, however, be apparent to all impartial observers of European politics that the action of the Vatican during the pontificate of Leo XIII has been largely responsible for the ever-increasing weakness of the one great European Power which has retained its conservative principles and its Catholic traditions and allegiance intact. We are not prepared to say that Leo XIII could have suppressed the racial conflicts which threaten to disintegrate the Austro-Hungarian Empire; but we affirm without hesitation that discouragement on the part of the Catholic clergy would have kept these conflicts in check for many years.

The short-sighted policy of harassing Austria in every portion of her dominions during the past decade has, as all the world now knows, met with retaliation from the Imperial government in an unforeseen but none the less efficacious manner. Although no veto was formally declared by Austria against the election of Cardinal Rampolla to the papal throne, it was officially stated in

the Conclave by Cardinal Puzyna that such an election would not be pleasing to the Austro-Hungarian government, and that it would be regarded by the Emperor as an unfriendly act. The unfortunate ex-Secretary of State had, as usual, to pay for the political blunders of his sovereign. He contented himself with entering a dignified protest against the implied interference with the liberty of the Sacred College in its choice of a supreme pontiff, adding, we believe, with some cynicism, that he was proud to be the object of the interference in question. There can, we think, be but little doubt that, but for the profound personal regard which the Emperor Francis Joseph entertained for Leo XIII, the Austrian government would not have waited for the death of the Pope to administer to the Vatican a rebuff which would have been more severely felt than any other, and that the Emperor would have found himself obliged to visit Rome as the guest and ally of the King of Italy.

The attitude of the late Pope towards the kingdom of Italy has occupied the attention of many writers during the last few years. We confess that recent endeavours by authoritative English journals to represent this attitude as conciliatory have caused us some astonishment; but certainly not more so than they have caused in Italy itself. We are aware that conciliation is an elastic principle, which commits those who make themselves a party to it to as much or as little as circumstances may suggest. In the case of the differences existing between the Vatican and the Italian government, a very moderate quantity of official conciliation has for many years past suggested itself as being the most satisfactory basis for both parties to work upon, and will in all probability continue so to suggest itself for many years to come.

On the election of Cardinal Pecci to the vacant throne of Pius IX, many Italian politicians of moderate liberal tendencies hoped and believed that an era of reconciliation with the Vatican had dawned for their country. The Bishop of Perugia, while strenuously defending the rights of the Vatican in his Umbrian diocese, had shown on more than one occasion that he was prepared to work together with Italian official authorities, among whom he possessed not a few personal friends; and, indeed, he owed his

election to the chair of St Peter in some measure to the fact that he was regarded by the less intransigent party in the Sacred College as a candidate who, as Pope, would safeguard the temporal interests of the Vatican and at the same time smooth away much of the bitter feeling hitherto existing between the ecclesiastical and the civil powers in Rome, and in Italy generally.

Among those who shared this belief in the new pontiff's conciliatory inclinations, certainly the most authoritative was the compiler of the famous Law of Guarantees, Ruggiero Bonghi. Catholic by conviction, Ruggiero Bonghi was, at the same time, devoted heart and soul to the cause of his country; and he and Signor de Cesare may be quoted as being indubitably the most brilliant and clear-minded writers on the vexed and complicated question of the relative rights of Church and State in Italy. A series of able articles from Signor Bonghi's pen dealing with this subject appeared in the 'Nuova Antologia,' commencing so long ago as 1870 and continuing at intervals up to 1895, the closing year of his life. Writing in the issue of the 'Nuova Antologia' of March 15, 1878, a few days after the coronation of Pope Leo XIII, Signor Bonghi explained his reasons for believing that a period of peace and goodwill between Church and State may be about to begin under the successor to Pius IX. His observations on the subject, from the point of view of the modern Italian Catholic, are so trenchant in their argument, so concise and brilliant in their expression and language, that we prefer to give the following pregnant paragraph in its original form:—

'Quanto all' Italia' (he writes) 'il mio desiderio è, per vero dire, uno solo. Il regno d' Italia non ha nessun bisogno per vivere che il Pontefice lo riconosca. Pretendere ch' egli lo faccia ed insieme rinunzi al vecchio diritto della sovranità sua con esplicita dichiarazione sarebbe vano, e ora e poi. È un diritto di cui il tempo sperderà la memoria, come il tempo l'aveva fatto. Basta che nell' animo del Pontefice entri una convinzione molto semplice e razionale: questa, cioè, che il Regno è una forma di Stato in cui la generalità del popolo italiano acconsente, e che ha tutti gli elementi, se non per durare eterna, almeno per durare quanto dura ogni cosa umana piu stabile.

'Se questa persuasione così naturale si fa strada, la conse-

guenza sarà una sola. I Cattolici, che finora per autorità del Pontefice sono rimasti fuori della vita politica italiana, e il clero vi prenderanno parte. I dissensi persisteranno: ma saranno dissensi tra cittadini persuasi di dovere e di volere vivere dentro uno Stato, non dissensi fra cittadini dei quali alcuni vogliono lo Stato che esiste, altri sono creduti pronti e disposti a dilacerarlo e a distruggerlo.'

Signor Bonghi, in the same article from which the above extract is taken, proceeds to give his reasons why, in his opinion, much may be hoped for from the newly crowned pontiff who, as Bishop of Perugia, had shown symptoms of being animated by more friendly if not more patriotic feelings towards the new Italy than those entertained by Pius IX. It is instructive to note how, in his subsequent writings, Ruggiero Bonghi gradually loses his belief in the conciliatory tendencies of Leo XIII; how disillusion follows disillusion, until he is compelled sorrowfully to admit, in an article published not many months before his death, that the policy and attitude of Leo towards his country had been one of ceaseless and bitter hostility.

We have seen it urged in more than one leading English journal that, in the course of the twenty-five years during which Leo XIII ruled in the Vatican, the *modus vivendi* between Church and State in Italy became greatly facilitated; and this more harmonious state of things has been attributed to the presumed liberal-minded and conciliatory disposition of Leo XIII himself. It is undoubtedly true that the so-called Roman question no longer divides the whole of Italy into hostile camps, as it did when Gioacchino Pecci ascended the pontifical throne. But a generation has passed away since the troops of United Italy entered Rome and the temporal power of the Popes fell. 'Il tempo è galantuomo'; and time, not policy, has been the great conciliator between the Italian government and the Vatican, as Ruggiero Bonghi foresaw must be the case.

For all practical purposes the *status quo* between the civil and the ecclesiastical power possesses advantages which each is well aware that it could ill afford to dispense with. In the mind of the educated Italian citizen, Ultramontanism and Anti-clericalism are terms which have lost their former significance. Civil dissensions

there are, and must always be, in any nation which embraces provinces differing so widely in customs, dialects, and characteristics as do those of Italy. But, as Signor Bonghi aptly declares, 'the Italian citizen is convinced that it is his duty and his pleasure to exist within a state'; and the determination of the vast majority is that the form of government of that state should be constitutional monarchy.

The limited space at our disposal obliges us strictly to confine ourselves to discussing the political and social attitude of Pope Leo XIII towards the kingdom of Italy; and the reverse side of the picture can be but briefly touched upon in these pages. If any proof were wanting of the strict and honourable adherence of the Italian state and people to the obligations towards the Vatican undertaken by Italy in accordance with the Law of Guarantees,* the recent events which have occurred in Rome should supply it. The attitude of the government and of the Roman populace during the period immediately preceding and following the death of Leo XIII have commanded admiration and respect from the whole world. In the eyes of United Italy it was the head of Christendom who was lying on his death-bed, whose sovereign prerogatives she had undertaken to safeguard and protect, not the enemy within her gates who, during his long pontificate, had never ceased to attempt to weaken and humiliate her. And yet, three years previously, when the King of Italy fell at the hands of an assassin and the country was plunged into mourning, no word of sympathy was spoken by Leo XIII; no message of consolation came from the Vatican. Instead of an expression of Christian charity, or even of condemnation of the savage crime, there appeared the famous or, we should rather say, infamous *communiqué* in the official column of the Vatican organ, 'L'Osservatore Romano,' and the heartless affront to the widowed Queen prohibiting any use of the prayer she had composed in the first hours of her sorrow—a

* The Law of Guarantees (1871) secured the Pope in the enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives of sovereignty, gave him free use of the Vatican and Lateran palaces, with special postal privileges and a large annual dotation, and guaranteed to him freedom in the exercise of his spiritual ministry, surrendering the right of nominating bishops. (See Bolton King, 'History of Italian Unity,' ii, 380-81.)

prayer which had already received the official approbation of one of the most saintly bishops of the Roman Church. We may turn, however, from such petty, though none the less significant, examples of the late Pope's sentiments towards Italy and the House of Savoy to his political action with regard to the Italian kingdom both within and beyond its frontiers.

From the very commencement of his pontificate, Leo XIII permitted no doubt to exist as to the attitude he intended to assume towards the Italian government. He never ceased to denounce that government as usurpatory; and each successive scheme for reconciliation between Church and State in Italy proceeding from liberal-minded ecclesiastics such as Fathers Tosti and Curci, Monsignor Bonomelli, the Bishop of Cremona, and others, was inexorably condemned by him. The famous formula of his predecessor, Pius IX, 'nè eletti, nè elettori,' which made it impossible for an Italian subject to be at the same time a useful citizen and a good Catholic from the Vatican's point of view, was upheld and emphasised by Pope Leo XIII. A letter addressed by him to Cardinal Nina, who was appointed Secretary of State immediately after the papal coronation, was practically a declaration of irreconcilable hostility towards United Italy, although couched in less violent language than that which had characterised similar utterances on the part of Pius IX. The party within the Church which had hailed the election of the Bishop of Perugia to the papal throne as that of a harbinger of internal peace and of conciliation with the monarchy, to the lasting advantage of both Church and State, was speedily reduced to silence by the first encyclical of the new pontiff, published on the Easter day following his enthronement. Moderate Italians of all shades of political opinion, who, Catholic at heart, yet dreamed of the realisation of Cavour's '*libera chiesa in libero stato*,' found themselves face to face with an antagonist less noisy, perhaps, than Pius IX, but certainly not less uncompromising.

Every liberal measure for which Italy had been striving for thirty years before the election of Leo XIII to the papal throne was in turn condemned by the pontiff whom it has been the fashion to regard as conciliatory and liberal-minded in his policy; every theory considered

by modern society to be beneficial to its progress and development was combated and denounced by him as contrary to the divine will. Liberty of worship, of thought, of education; freedom of the Press; the right of the people to elect their representatives in a national parliament—all these things were in their turn the object of condemnation.

Of all the hostile measures adopted by the late Pope against the Italian state, we believe that the only one which has had any directly injurious effect was the renewal and continuance of the prohibition of Catholics from voting at political elections. At the present moment the public mind in Italy is not a little exercised as to the possibilities of the 'Non Expedit' being, if not altogether withdrawn, at least greatly modified. It is generally, and probably not untruly, believed that the action of the Vatican in forbidding Catholics to vote at parliamentary elections was prompted by the desire to render impossible any assembly which should be completely representative of national political feeling, and thereby to create a position of ever-increasing embarrassment for each succeeding government, to whatever party this government might belong. We have no hesitation in saying that such was the primary aim of Pius IX and his advisers, who placed little credence in the observation of King Victor Emmanuel on entering Rome—'ci siamo, e ci resteremo.' By degrees, however, an attitude assumed, it may reasonably be suspected, as a tentative measure, has become a very serious factor in the social life of the Italian state, and one which must occupy the attention of every thoughtful Italian, with whatever political or religious party his sympathies may be. We would suggest, moreover, that, indirectly, the position created by the continuance of the 'Non Expedit' policy of the Vatican must compel the attention of political and social thinkers outside Italy, inasmuch as the days when Italy was merely a geographical expression are long gone by.

We have said that the 'Non Expedit' was primarily intended to create difficulties and embarrassments for the Italian government. The gradual but sure consolidation of the new order of things in Italy, however, assuredly did not escape the observation of the acute successor to

Pius IX; and, in the meantime, the natural march of events has widened the aspirations of clericalism, formerly only bent upon bringing about a return to the *status quo ante*—an illusion now shared by none save fanatics in Italy, and, strange to say, by certain influential members of the Roman Catholic communion in this country. The clerical party in Italy has gained not less, and probably more, from thirty years of settled and united government than its nominal opponents. It numbers in its ranks a considerable proportion both of the aristocracy and the upper *bourgeoisie*—men, in fact, who are as much interested as their anti-clerical neighbours in preventing any revolutionary programme from being brought into practical operation. It can scarcely be denied that were the official programme of the clerical party to be carried into effect in Italy nothing short of a revolution could be the result. As a matter of fact, that party may be said to live on the government which, on paper, it regards as the creature of free-thought, freemasonry, and all the freedoms dreaded by priests from the beginning of time. The sons of families belonging to the middle classes, and often the fathers themselves of those families, are, as a rule, employés in one capacity or another of the state, and depend upon the government for their daily bread.

It is unnecessary to advert to the attempts made at different times by the Italian government to find some mode of compromise with the Vatican without surrendering those rights which the will of the vast majority of the nation had confided to its care by the plebiscite of 1870. The proposed cession of the so-called Leonine city to the civil jurisdiction of the Pope, together with a strip of territory reaching to the sea-coast, has never, we believe, owing to the obvious difficulties and inconveniences its adoption would entail upon both governments, been seriously considered by either party. The clerical party, indeed, maintains an ambiguous reserve as to what terms would be accepted by the Vatican; and in that reserve lies much of its strength. It may be described as an unknown quantity remaining outside the active political orbit, the effects of whose sudden entry into the political life of the country could not be gauged with any accuracy.

It is obvious that, were the 'Non Expedit' to be with-

drawn, a clerical group would immediately be added to the number of those which have already done much to weaken each successive ministry, and have by no means contributed to the dignity of the Italian Chamber or to its popularity with the country. The means at the disposal of such a group, and, if we are to judge from the methods pursued by the clerical elements in other continental parliaments, the tactics it would probably pursue, would speedily raise it to be an important factor at Montecitorio. It is scarcely conceivable that such a group should exist within the Italian Parliament and yet pretend to ignore the periodical denunciations on the part of the Pope of Italian institutions, and the claims of the papacy to a temporal jurisdiction which could not be satisfied without causing revolution and civil war, not in Rome alone, but throughout the Italian peninsula and Sicily. Any clerical group sent to Montecitorio by a clerical vote must infallibly become a revolutionary party,—unless, indeed, the Vatican were to withdraw all claims to temporal jurisdiction over Rome; and such a party could not fail to be a source of embarrassment, not only to the Vatican, but also to itself.

It has often been pointed out that Leo XIII was guilty of inconsistency when he ordered the French Catholics to support the Republic as long as that form of government should be accepted by France; and his attitude towards the Italian monarchy has been quoted as a proof of this inconsistency. It is apt to be forgotten, however, that Leo XIII demanded of the French Catholics that they should support the civil power, whatever temporary form that power might, by the will of the majority, assume; and that they were urged to distinguish between the constitutional form of government and the leaders and parties by which that government was carried on. They were directed to be loyal to the constitution; but at the same time they were ordered so to unite and consolidate their political vote that it should be in their power to bring into office only men who should govern in accordance with Catholic spirit and tradition. That Pope Leo XIII maintained and upheld the 'Non Expedit' in Italy is, in our opinion, a proof of his political consistency. Had he withdrawn it he would have stultified his political action both in France and in Germany.

by creating a revolutionary party within a Catholic state; he would have alienated from the clerical party in Italy the sympathies of a large proportion of its tacit supporters, the security of whose temporal affairs depends upon the internal peace and settled government of the country; and he would, moreover, have increased the dreaded influence of the Socialists by still further weakening the hands of the great constitutional parties in the Italian Parliament.

It is premature to attempt to foretell what may be the attitude adopted by Pope Pius X towards this complicated question. It was regarded by his immediate predecessor from a purely political point of view. It is possible that the present pontiff may look at it in a less mundane way, and in one more befitting his position as spiritual pastor of his Italian flock. We confess, however, that we are unable to believe that either Pius X or any succeeding Pope will find himself able finally to renounce all pretensions to temporal sovereignty while the conditions of society remain in their present state. A withdrawal of the 'Non Expedit' in Italy would, in the opinion of many Italians belonging both to clerical and constitutional parties, with whom we have had the privilege of discussing the subject, be a grave political and social blunder, unless accompanied by a renunciation on the part of the Church of claims which it has taken long centuries to consolidate, and the abandonment of which can only be accomplished by the slow and sure progress of future years.

There is, however, as we have already hinted, another aspect to this question. While the political situation created by the forced abstention from the polls of all Italians possessing the franchise who place their theoretical duty to the Church before their practical duty to their country is of decided advantage to the Vatican, the Italian government is, as Signor Bonghi affirms in his article from which we have already quoted, in too secure and logical a position to make its official recognition or non-recognition by the Vatican a matter of any great moment. Both Vatican and Quirinal, therefore, are not unwilling to allow matters to remain as they are. Notwithstanding the diatribes appearing in the journals of the respective governments, a mutual understanding exists on all matters of practical importance; and the

communication between them is far more constant and, we may add, more amicable than is generally supposed to be the case.

We have yet, however, to consider the effect of ecclesiastical prohibition of Catholics from voting at the political elections on the nation at large; and it is to the Italian people we must look, and not to the rival governments seated in Rome, in order to realise the cynical indifference of Vaticanism towards any other consideration than political expediency. It was this motive that prompted the late Pope Leo XIII deliberately to refuse to some millions of Italian Catholics the right of voting at parliamentary elections. A new generation has been born and arrived at manhood during his long pontificate—a generation which, we may observe, is not anti-clerical, or anti-Christian, but frankly and good-humouredly indifferent to any form of dogmatic religion; and therefore, *per contra*, to any form of anti-clericalism or atheism. It can scarcely have escaped the observation of the Vatican that this spirit of indifference is rapidly spreading, even among the least educated classes in Italy; nor that in Italy, as in other continental countries, Catholicism as a spiritual force, is steadily losing its hold upon the masses.

There can be little doubt that, had the action of the Vatican not tended deliberately to exclude all Catholic influence from the parliamentary electorate, much of the indifferentism, so remarkable to any foreign observer who enjoys opportunities of being brought into contact with the middle and lower Italian classes, would not exist.

Pope Leo XIII has taught the modern Italian that, if he would be considered a 'good' Catholic in the eyes of the Church, he must take no part in the forming of his country's future; and it may reasonably be supposed that, in reaffirming and maintaining the prohibition issued by Pius IX, he must have chosen to sacrifice the spiritual needs of his Italian children rather than weaken the political position secured to the Vatican by the 'Non Expedit.' It was frequently stated in the columns of clerical newspapers and reviews during the lifetime of the late Pope that he was only waiting for a favourable moment to withdraw the 'Non Expedit,' and to throw

the whole weight of the Catholic vote into the arena of Italian politics. We imagine, however, that Leo XIII and his advisers were perfectly well aware that, beyond the introduction into the Italian Chamber of an unruly and possibly compromising group, little would be gained by such a step; while much might be lost by revealing to the world that the indifferentism to which we have alluded had considerably diminished the pretended strength of Catholicism as a political influence in the country.

There is, moreover, a financial side to the question which must not be lost sight of. The important part played by finance in the late pontificate will probably never be known save to a very few. It is, however, we believe, an open secret that intense dissatisfaction exists in certain official quarters with the whole financial condition of the Vatican, and with the way in which vast sums have been squandered during recent years in unprofitable speculations, and in advancing capital to impoverished Roman nobles belonging to the Vatican party on securities possessing little value beyond that of the paper upon which they were inscribed. The difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of obtaining any trustworthy information as to the financial system pursued by the administrators of the papal treasury has been the subject of protest on the part of more than one prominent cardinal not belonging to the Curia. The heavy losses for which Monsignor Folchi was made the scapegoat some years ago, and the more recent disappearance of a large sum of money from safes in the papal apartment of which the Pope himself was said to keep the keys, created a feeling of distrust which has by no means subsided. It is evident that where princes of the Church are unable to obtain satisfactory information, the outside world can have little facility for forming anything but untrustworthy surmises. We believe, however, that Leo XIII was his own Chancellor of the Exchequer; and his severity towards Monsignor Folchi was considered by many of those in a position to judge, to be another instance of his readiness to allow others to suffer for his own mistakes.

It must be remembered that the legend of the 'Prisoner of the Vatican' has been of great pecuniary value. Since

the early Middle Ages no pontificate has witnessed so perpetual a flow of pilgrims bearing gifts in money and kind to the Vicar of Christ as that which has just closed. Nor can we wonder, in view of the grotesque misrepresentations of the position of the sovereign pontiff which perpetually appear in clerical journals, and which form the subject of moving discourses from the pulpits in country districts and in the poorer quarters of great towns, that this should be the case. As the withdrawal of the 'Non Expedit' would of necessity signify recognition on the part of the Vatican of the Italian constitution and of the national Parliament seated in the Italian capital, it is not easy to understand how the fiction of persecution and lack of independence could logically be maintained by the clerical party, should its members be allowed to go to the polls.

There can be little doubt that Pope Leo XIII, like many a lesser man, was keenly alive to the advantages accompanying the possession of money. If we are to believe those who were personally acquainted with its members, the generation of the Pecci family, of which Gioacchino Pecci was the last survivor, was not conspicuous for its liberality; and several instances might be recounted to show that Leo XIII was by no means addicted to acts of generosity, even towards those who might reasonably be supposed to have some claims upon his purse. There are many who believe Leo XIII to have been more influenced by pecuniary considerations, both in his French and in his Italian policy, than is generally supposed; and there can be no doubt that, while in France his policy chiefly aimed at cajoling the government into tolerating the political and commercial abuses practised by certain of the so-called religious congregations in return for Catholic support of the Republic, in Italy his ceaseless opposition to any open conciliation with the monarchy was not a little prompted by the consciousness that conciliation must infallibly lead to a grave diminution, if not a total cessation, of the contributions from all parts of the world in aid of the persecuted and imprisoned head of the Church.

We are not aware that there is anything in the political relations of the late Pope with the United

Kingdom calling for special attention in these pages, except his action in Ireland, and his decision, most unfortunately wrung from him against his better judgment, as to the validity of orders in the Anglican Church.

Towards Irish disaffection Leo XIII may be said to have assumed an attitude diametrically opposed to that which he displayed towards the Slav national movement in Austria-Hungary. His letters to the Irish bishops, at a period when matters in Ireland were drifting into a position in which serious collision with the government seemed to be inevitable, contained earnest exhortations to respect for, and co-operation with, the British authorities, and reiterated the firm belief of the writer in British equity and generosity. When these measures failed, Leo XIII despatched the late Cardinal, at that time Monsignore, Persico to Ireland, with instructions to examine the political and social situation and to report directly to the Pope the result of his examination.

Cardinal Persico's mission, as he often subsequently informed us, was a task by no means easy of fulfilment. The result of his report on the Irish Nationalist organisations was an unequivocal condemnation of the methods of violence and sedition by which those organisations sought at that period to attain their ends; and, as is well known, the Pope's disapproval and recommendations were alike received in a spirit anything but submissive or obedient by the agitators, both clerical and lay. It may be observed that there was no ground for a political *arrière-pensée* in the mind of Leo XIII to influence his action in Ireland, such as those which undoubtedly influenced his policy towards the disaffected races in the Austrian Empire. The goodwill of the British government towards Catholicism might be acquired without risk of interfering with the political aims of Vaticanism; and the Pope cherished hopes that official diplomatic relations with England might spring from his action.

Into the question of the papal decision as to the validity of Anglican orders, it hardly comes within the scope of this review to enter. We have been assured on very high authority that Pope Leo XIII was from the first disinclined to reopen the controversy on the subject, and still more so to pronounce a definite opinion upon a question which, though brought to his notice by the representatives of a

party within the Anglican Church, had not been raised by any official or authoritative section of that communion. We have been further assured that Leo XIII was personally of the same favourable opinion as to the probable validity of the orders of the English Church as was held by one of the most learned and unprejudiced members of the commission appointed by him to enquire into the subject. Other counsels, however, prevailed in the end. The late Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster once more afforded a proof of his complete ignorance as to the character and sentiments of the vast majority of his compatriots by using all his influence to secure a decision of invalidity, under the impression that a general secession of beneficed clergy from the English Church would be the immediate result. The story of this fiasco is of too recent a date to need repetition here; but it must be confessed that seldom in the course of its history has the Vatican been misled into making so false a step as when it took official cognisance of a request emanating from an unofficial body of Anglican Churchmen. But, as we have already pointed out, Cardinal Vaughan and the English Roman Catholic bishops were alone responsible for this egregious blunder, which practically had no other result than to demonstrate in an unmistakable manner the profound indifference of the immense majority of the English clergy and laity to the opinions of the Vatican on such subjects.

There are many other points in the world-embracing activity of Pope Leo XIII upon which inevitable restrictions of space forbid us to touch; and upon some of these, such as his attitude towards the so-called Americanism in the Catholic Church in the United States, we refrain from commenting, inasmuch as they belong to the spiritual rather than to the purely political category of his pontifical actions. Whether the ceaseless energy displayed by the late Pope in the field of European politics has been productive of any lasting benefit to the great spiritual body of which he was the head, or whether he has only succeeded in temporarily increasing the strength and influence of a political clericalism which has little enough of the spirit of Christ in its constitution, time alone can show. If we are to judge by the universal satisfaction expressed at the election of Cardinal Sarto to

be his successor, we must conclude that the world was weary of the constant interference of the Vatican in its political affairs, and that the policy of Leo XIII was not regarded as successful even in professedly Catholic countries.

Before concluding our review of the remarkable pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, we would briefly glance at the heritage which he has left to his successor in St Peter's chair.

In Italy the official situation between Church and State remains the same as it was in 1878, when Cardinal Pecci ascended the papal throne; nor is it likely that it will be modified to any material extent by Pope Pius X. Austria, by her action in the recent Conclave, has manifested in no ambiguous way her dissatisfaction with the policy adopted by the late Pope within her dominions, and her fear lest it should be continued by his successor. It may be considered as unlikely that the anxiety recently displayed by the Emperor William to propitiate the Holy See has for its ultimate object any other than that which must be apparent to all who are conversant with the relative positions of the political parties in the Reichstag, and the necessities in which his Majesty finds himself placed with regard to them. That these necessities might at any time disappear, and the aspect of affairs change within the German Empire, is probably as well understood in the Vatican as it is in Berlin. In France Pius X has a tangled skein to unravel; and in Belgium the *volte-face* of Leo XIII from Socialism has lost to the Vatican much of its former influence. In Russia diplomatic relations with the Holy See were resumed during the latter years of the late pontificate at a sacrifice of local Roman Catholic interests which a Pope who is regarded as a pastor rather than as a politician might well hesitate to increase.

Pope Leo XIII has left the papacy officially at peace with every country save Italy; but it may be doubted whether this peace be durable. A large number of thinking Catholics of every nation have regarded with not a little uneasiness the materialisation, if such a term be permissible, of Roman Catholicism under his guiding influence. The organisation of a militant party and a

militant press in every state, ever ready to take advantage of the internal and external embarrassments of that state in order to further the political and social aims of Vaticanism, cannot be said to be favourable to the peace and welfare of any country in which it prosecutes its labours. It is but necessary to glance at the internal conditions of France, of Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Italy, in order to learn an object-lesson from the action of a political party carrying on its campaign in the name of Catholicism. It is but necessary to subscribe to certain clerical journals widely circulated in those countries, in order to realise to what extent superstition has been employed as the handmaid to political and social agitation during the pontificate of Leo XIII. As we observed in the first portion of this review, the late Pope was acute enough indirectly to utilise some of the very elements of unrest in modern society which he condemned alike on religious and on social grounds. The liberty and licence of the Press, to take but one example, formed the subject on more than one occasion of his denunciation; and yet no occupant of St Peter's chair ever relied so much on the public Press as Leo XIII; nor, without his encouragement and support, more or less directly accorded, could politico-clerical journalism have attained such proportions or commanded such influence as has been the case in the last twenty-five years.

The vote of the Sacred College has fallen upon a cardinal who, to quote the expression of the eminent Italian writer on the position of the Vatican, Signor de Cesare, may be regarded in some sense as a possible 'Papa di ripiego.' That the Patriarch of Venice was chosen to be the successor to Leo XIII may reasonably be taken to denote that the personal influence of the late pontiff, admiration for his intellectual activity, and veneration for his age and character, were insufficient to stifle, even in the Sacred College itself, a growing distrust of his political restlessness, or to allay fears lest the keys of St Peter might again be delivered into the hands of a pope who should be more politician than pastor.

We do not believe the protest on the part of Austria against the possible election of Cardinal Rampolla to have carried the weight with the Conclave which has been ascribed to it in some quarters. It must be re-

membered that the veto, or, as it is more officially termed, the *esclusiva*, was denounced both by Gregory XVI and by Pius IX as an unwarrantable interference with the liberty of the Sacred College in exercising its highest and most responsible privilege; and that, moreover, any plausible motive for thus turning into a political farce the solemn pretensions of a Conclave was swept away when the power of electing a candidate to the papal throne was taken out of the hands of the Roman clergy and populace and confided solely to the Cardinalate. There can be little doubt that the Sacred College would not to-day tolerate the formal insistence, on the part of any of the three Powers which once exercised the right of veto, to revive a practice so derogatory to its dignity and supernatural claims. At the same time, it is more than probable that Cardinal Puzyna's inspired observation, at a moment when the voting of the Conclave appeared to be tending in favour of the minister who was generally regarded as responsible for much of the dead Pope's foreign policy, must have deepened the already strong conviction of the dangers which might result should that policy be continued.

We have seen it stated that Pope Pius X will be a 'liberal' pope. Similar statements, we need hardly remind our readers, were also made concerning Pius IX and Leo XIII; and it is scarcely necessary to point out that such a combination is, and must be, impossible. It is conceivable, and even likely, that laments over the loss of territorial sovereignty and misleading assertions as to the position of the Holy See will be heard less frequently from Pius X than from his immediate predecessor. His present Holiness preserved a significant silence on the subject when replying to a telegram of congratulation recently sent to him by the German Catholic Congress, in which hopes were expressed that the temporal power might be restored to him. Pope Pius X may feel that silence on this question, while implying no consent towards the new order of things, is preferable to, and more dignified than, violent statements which are both untrue and illogical. But it must not be forgotten that, as Bishop of Mantua and as Patriarch of Venice, the present Pope showed, both in his pastorals and in his episcopal action, a sacerdotal intolerance of liberty of

thought and conscience scarcely compatible with conciliatory or liberal tendencies. The 'liberal' Catholic movement has been denounced by him in terms as unmeasured as any employed by Pope Leo XIII.

The first encyclicals of Pius X will be awaited with curiosity and anxiety by all those who have realised that in the last twenty-five years the influence of the Vatican has become a factor in European politics which cannot be ignored. The world at large may be indifferent as to whether the successor to Leo XIII prove himself to be reactionary or liberal in his attitude towards the struggle for spiritual and intellectual freedom which, notwithstanding all assertions to the contrary, is being carried on as keenly, though perhaps less openly, in the Roman communion as in other Christian bodies. Those, however, who have followed with any attention European social and political history during the last two decades will be deeply interested in observing the uses to which Pope Pius X will put the political legacy left him by his predecessor. There are many who believe that, at perhaps no very distant period, the militant clerical elements which Leo XIII succeeded in welding into a weapon for the defence of the material needs of the Church will be found to be weakening its spiritual influence, and to be a source of future danger and embarrassment in the fight waged by Roman Catholicism for supremacy over the mind and the conscience of mankind.

Art. VII.—THE REIGN OF THE ENGINEER.

1. *Education and Empire.* By the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P. London: Murray, 1902.
2. *National Education. Essays towards a Constructive Policy.* Edited by Laurie Magnus, M.A. London: Murray, 1901.
3. *Report of the Special Sub-committee of the London County Council Technical Education Board on the application of Science to Industry.* July 15, 1902.
4. *Annual Reports of the Technical Education Board of the London County Council.* 1901-1902.
5. *The Training of Engineers in the United States.* Professor W. E. Dalby. London: Institution of Naval Architects, 1903.
6. *On the Influence of Brain-power on History.* An address delivered before the British Association at Southport, Sept. 9, 1903, by Sir Norman Lockyer, K.C.B., F.R.S., President. London: Macmillan, 1903.

ALTHOUGH a somewhat restricted meaning is generally given to the word engineer, yet, broadly speaking, and in contradistinction to those who are engaged in extending the boundaries of scientific knowledge, all who apply science to practical uses may be termed engineers. Modern society would be impossible without this class of workers; but their value has yet to be fully appreciated. Many of the evils which debase civilisation would be removed and there would be far more happiness, progress would be far more rapid, the general standard of comfort would be far higher, if we could but be persuaded to recognise the value of the engineer and allow him a greater degree of freedom and larger opportunities. Some few of those who are in touch with the world see that such is the case;* and the Admiralty has recently set a striking

* For instance, in discussing naval training before the Royal United Service Institution in 1900, Mr J. R. Thursfield rightly insisted that 'the problem is not to be solved by rule of thumb, by tinkering here and there, at a routine still saturated at every point with the tradition of masts and sails and their discipline. The rule of thumb has had its day. The command of the world's forces, of the forces of nature and those of society alike, belongs henceforth to those who understand them best and know how to direct them most skilfully, who have best learnt how to transform the power of knowledge into the power of action.'

example in this direction. The scheme formulated a few months ago for the training of naval officers—which is to make them all engineers—should indeed not only instruct public opinion as to the manner in which the requirements of a modern navy must be met but should also focus attention on the wider problem which the State offers; it should promote due recognition of the fact that the nation at large stands in need of training that will enable it to understand and cope with modern requirements, a recognition far too long delayed for safety. Unfortunately academic tradition hampers progress in every direction; we make no real attempt to divest ourselves of its influence and at most tinker here and there.

Mr Haldane, who has done so much, of late years, to bring the subject before the public, has rightly associated education with empire. In order to maintain our empire, our educational system must at least be on a level with those of other nations; it should and might well be in advance. As Mr Haldane points out:—

‘To-day, at the beginning of the twentieth century, we as a nation have to face the problem of preserving our great commercial position and with it the great empire which the great men of past generations have won and handed down to us. That empire it is our duty to hold as a sacred trust and to pass on in such a fashion that those who come after may be proud of us, as we are proud of the forefathers who did their work before our time. The duty which we have to discharge requires an effort. That effort must assume the form neither of swaggering along the High Street of the world nor of sitting down with folded hands on a dust-heap. It is rather to be sought in clear views and activity of the kind that is at once unhesitating and unrelenting. Around us is surging up a flood of new competition. If we are to hold the ground which our predecessors won before the days of that competition, we shall require above all things enlightened views, and, not least, enlightened views about our commerce and enlightened views about the common constitution which unites us with our colonies and dependencies.’ (Preface, p. vii.)

Unfortunately, clear views are not easily formed; what is worse, if there be not unwillingness to co-operate on the part of those who might contribute to their formation in the public mind, there is the very greatest

difficulty in securing a proper consideration of the complex problems confronting us. Great Britain, as Mr Haldane says (p. 7),

'must continue to increase her commercial output; for it is the foundation on which rest her financial resources, her fleet, her hold on her colonies and dependencies . . . she must not only maintain the volume of her trade, but increase it, as the demand for expenditure goes on increasing.'

This is undoubtedly the case. As our continued existence as an empire depends on our navy, and we must increase our navy to keep pace with other nations, it is obvious that the outlay will be very much greater in future years than it is now. But where is the money to come from? British coal and iron are fast diminishing; and we have few other raw materials worth mentioning, except brains. But the manufacture of brains into a highly finished and efficient product is an industry in which we take no pains to excel and of which there is no organisation, although of all industries in which we can engage, it is certainly the most important.

When Watt perfected the steam engine, he not only made it possible to raise coal economically but he started an industrial revolution which has now spread over the civilised world. The merchant is as much affected as the manufacturer. Economists are clear on this point.

'The struggle of the future must inevitably be between a number of great nations, more or less equally well equipped, carrying on production by the same general methods, and each trying to strengthen its industrial and commercial position by the adoption of the most highly developed machinery and of all the methods suggested by scientific research, policy, or experience. Under these conditions it is no longer possible for the individual merchant or for small groups of merchants to acquaint themselves, by personal experience alone, with more than a fractional part of the causes which affect the business in which they are engaged. The spread of the modern industrial system has brought with it the modern State, with its millions of consumers, its vast area, its innumerable activities, its complicated code of industrial and commercial law. At the same time the revolution in the means of transport and communication has destroyed, or is tending to destroy, local markets, and has closely inter-

woven all the business of the world. Events in the most distant countries, industrial and commercial movements at first sight unrelated to the concerns of the individual merchant, now exert a direct and immediate influence upon his interests.' ('National Education,' p. 184.)

So writes Professor Hewins in discussing commercial education in connexion with university training. Professor Marshall, in a recent pamphlet advocating the importance of economics as a subject of university study, is eloquent to the same effect, painting a disquieting picture which deserves the gravest consideration:—

'In the first half of the nineteenth century we could boast that ten of our countrymen could do as much in almost any branch of industry as twenty foreigners, because they were better fed and equipped with better appliances. But, as the century wore on, the shackles of political despotism were loosened on the Continent; and when 1871 had seen the close of the wars in western Europe, there grew up a generation of workers who turned their increasing command over nature to account in providing the two sources of energy—better food and better education. A great part of our working population was already fairly well fed; and we turned our growing wealth to less good account. Our education has improved slowly; and our physical energy, though perhaps on the whole as great as ever, is certainly less relatively to that of other northern nations than it was even half a century ago, while there has perhaps been some decline in our willingness to exert ourselves. We are no longer at the high premium at which we were for those operations in ironworks, etc. which require exceptional powers of endurance; and in manual skill we have been nearly overtaken by several nations who were far behind us. Our great store of wealth has given us an advantage, and it is increasing as fast as ever. But, after deducting land, it is even now less than ten years' income; and we should quickly be passed by rivals still some way behind us if their productive energy were a little greater than our own and their mode of living a little more sparing. Thirty years ago it was expected that the beginning of this century would see the white population of the British Empire greater than that of the German; but this hope has been disappointed. If similar changes continue for long and go much further, our surplus of revenue over expenditure, available for naval and military use, will be less than that of Germany.'

What precisely are our shortcomings? what is it that we are called on to remedy? It is essential that we should be clear on these points. Comparison has been frequently made between England and Germany, especially as regards the extent to which industry is influenced by the character of training given in the schools and universities. Mr Haldane has much to say on this subject; and it figures largely in the Report of the Special Sub-committee of the Technical Education Board of the London County Council. In this Report we read (p. 5):—

‘That industries are affected by education is perhaps best proved by the vitality of scientific industries in those countries in which the system of secondary education is supplemented by scientific education of university rank, for the perfecting of which no expense is spared. This condition obtains in Germany, Switzerland, and the United States; and in these countries scientific industries have rapidly developed, whereas in England they have been either stationary or retrograde. When Liebig commenced his work there was practically no scientific industry in Germany; in 1897 the total value of the productions of chemical industries alone amounted to 47,391,132*l*. In that year the state expended 31,609*l*. on the Technical High School in Berlin, and contributed 83 per cent. of the cost of maintenance of the Berlin University.’

Much of the industrial progress of Germany may undoubtedly be traced to Liebig; the debt which that country owes to his genius is indeed incalculable; but the whole civilised world is his debtor, England especially. It is worth while to consider what were the ways in which he exercised an influence. He was appointed professor in 1824, at the age of twenty-one. His book on agricultural chemistry was published in 1840. To quote the late Lord Playfair:—*

‘Two years after its publication, in 1842 . . . Liebig made a sort of triumphal tour in this country. He visited the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel, at Drayton Manor, and paid other visits to the great agriculturists of the day—Lord Spencer, Lord Ducie, Lord Fitzwilliam, Mr Pusey, and many others, as well as to most of the chief towns. At all places meetings were held; and Liebig, with his travelling companion, the genial

* Hofmann Memorial Lecture. ‘Journal of the Chemical Society,’ 1896, p. 577.

and celebrated geologist, Dr Buckland, had opportunities of disseminating his views on the importance of chemistry to mankind. The tour was a personally conducted one, like Cook's tours in the present day; the conductor and interpreter of the party, in fact, was a young man called Lyon Playfair, who took care that the effects of the tour should be felt in all the chief centres of Great Britain.

'The immediate effect of Liebig's tour was to make chemistry a popular science, and to induce colleges to open laboratories for teaching it. The School of Mines was opened in Jermyn Street, with—for the time—an excellent laboratory, which was always filled with students; still, its purposes were chiefly limited to the professional objects of the college. University College and King's College gave much attention to laboratory teaching. The popular wave of 1842-43 did not soon expend its force; and in 1845 the Royal College of Chemistry arose. I have mentioned these facts to show that the time had come to open a special college of chemistry. It could not have been created sooner than it was, because the demand would have been too limited: . . . If the College of Chemistry were as successful as I claim it to be, you may ask—why did it disappear?* It had no endowments, and depended to some extent on popular subscriptions. These were easy to obtain when chemistry had the temporary popularity which I described. Every landowner then thought that agricultural chemistry was to be his salvation. [The fact is] Liebig's book was not a muck manual, and did not produce the expected results.'

But not only was chemistry made popular in England by Liebig; his writings also gave the first impetus to agricultural research in this country. His early views on the influence of manures on the growth of plants were, at the outset, not only challenged but successfully challenged by a man whose name now ranks, in the opinion of scientific agriculturists the world over, with that of Liebig—the late Sir John Lawes. The experiments made at Rothamsted were the first to bring out the special value of nitrogenous manures to cereal crops, which Liebig had overlooked. Lawes was also led by his

* It disappeared only as a private institution. It was taken over by government and attached to the Royal School of Mines; it is now included in the Royal School of Science and will soon be accommodated in a palace at South Kensington—whether to arise as a phoenix from the ashes of the old college, as Lord Playfair hoped, the future will show.

experiments to attach great value to phosphatic manures for root-crops and became in consequence a manufacturer of superphosphate, thereby establishing an industry which has since assumed colossal proportions.

If we remember that at a later date the basic process for the manufacture of steel was conceived and successfully worked out in this country by Thomas and Gilchrist and others, and that the slag produced in this process has proved to be of value as a phosphatic manure, especially in Germany, where the process is now worked on a very large scale, we have here a striking illustration of the development of discoveries and important industries primarily in this country rather than in Germany.

But the beginning made by us under the inspiration of Liebig's genius in this case also has met with little public support. The experiments instituted by Sir J. Lawes to test Liebig's views, about sixty years ago, afterwards systematically carried on by him in conjunction with the late Sir H. Gilbert, and still continued at Rothamsted under the Lawes Agricultural Trust, are the most celebrated of their kind in the world. The example set by Lawes has been followed on the Continent and in America, where many agricultural experiment stations have been established and have received state aid. In England the state contributes practically nothing to such work. Rothamsted long remained in magnificent isolation—a pattern eagerly followed by the outside world but unregarded at home. The efforts made of late years to repair the neglect are altogether disproportionate to our requirements: we have done almost nothing towards training up a race of competent agricultural engineers. In the case of agriculture, therefore, it is clearly public indifference, not the lack of scientific initiative and example, nor that of scientific workers, that is at the root of our difficulties. But why is our public indifferent?

Mr Haldane, in speaking of the close contact between industrial and academic life in Germany—which he clearly recognises as the secret of German success—points to the stock illustration, the loss of the coal-tar industry. This loss, he tells us, has happened

‘because in Germany the manufacture has been fostered by research in the university laboratories and by careful teaching in the technical schools, with the result that great producing

institutions, such as the Badische Anilinfabrik, have an endless supply of directors and workmen trained in a fashion which we have not the means to imitate' (p. 17).

Again :

'No wonder that Berlin has been the theatre of marvellous conquests by science of the secrets of nature. It was, to mention a single instance, by patient use of the means placed by the State at his disposal in these laboratories that one of the best known of modern chemists, the late Professor Hofmann, developed so enormously the theory of the aniline colours and their production from coal-tar that this industry has passed from British into German hands' (p. 22).

The statement here made by Mr Haldane is repeated in the following passage in the Report of the Sub-committee of the Technical Education Board :—

'Different industries have been affected by different causes. Professors Ramsay and Thorpe and Mr Tyrer stated that the primary cause of the loss of the coal-tar colour industry was the loss of Hofmann. If Hofmann could have been induced to remain in England he would have collected round him a band of trained investigators by whom the industry would have been developed as fully as it has been in Germany. Dr Perkin attributed the stagnation of the industry to the scarcity in England of highly-trained chemists' (p. 5).

The Professor Hofmann mentioned in these extracts was one of Liebig's early pupils, the first professor at the College of Chemistry already referred to; he left us in 1864. The conclusions drawn both by Mr Haldane and by the Technical Education Board, as to the cause of the decay of the coal-tar colour industry in this country, require, however, to be modified in essential particulars.

As a matter of fact, the first aniline colour, mauveine, was discovered by W. H. Perkin, an Englishman, when a lad of eighteen, in 1856; and he shortly afterwards undertook its manufacture. Perkin, it is true, had been trained at the College of Chemistry by Hofmann, who had stirred up in him that love of research which is his distinguishing characteristic; but it can scarcely be doubted that the quality was innate, as it has appeared in his sons, two of whom are now fellows of the Royal Society and distinguished workers in the field in which the father has dis-

played such extraordinary ability. But the discovery of the colouring matter was entirely Perkin's own: it was a consequence of experiments made at his own inspiration; and the work was carried out in his own small private laboratory at home in the evenings and in the vacation.

The next act in the colour drama was played in France, where, three years after Perkin's discovery, rosaniline—the parent member of one great branch of the coal-tar colour tribe—first saw the light. The manufacture of this dye-stuff, which soon overshadowed its predecessor, was brought to perfection in this country by Nicholson (of the firm of Simpson, Maule and Nicholson), another of Hofmann's pupils. It was at this stage that Hofmann's influence really came in. He attached the very greatest importance to pure materials and had imbued Nicholson with his spirit; consequently the latter produced dye-stuffs on the manufacturing scale almost if not quite equal in quality to those which it was customary to make on the small scale in the laboratory. The example thus set in England had an abiding effect on the world; and, to the present day, colour works are nothing more or less than laboratories on a large scale. Hofmann's chief service to the industry, however, lay in the attention which he paid to the investigation of colouring matters; but his work in this field was mainly carried out before he left England, not in Germany, as Mr Haldane implies; the industry had ceased to develope here, if it was not already declining, before he left. Probably he saw what was happening and knew how unfavourable circumstances were to the industry—how entirely it was beyond his power to bring about a better state of affairs; hence his decision to leave the country which had become so much a home to him.

The transfer of the industry into German hands had taken place silently and independently of Hofmann. Manufacturers here had done little to keep in touch with their industry; in fact they had relied too much on Hofmann to do their laboratory work for them. They were satisfied to go on making the dye-stuffs they originally made. Having long held command of the market and amassed large fortunes, they did not see the need of new inventions; they therefore kept no adequate scientific staff

in their employment. The Germans, on the other hand, displayed the foresight and organising power, the patience and thoroughness which are characteristic of them; realising that the industry could be developed, they provided well equipped laboratories within their factories, and secured the most capable men they could find to work in them.

In Germany, a general burst of activity set in soon after the Franco-Prussian war, in this as in other industries; but the impetus came in a measure from England. In the year 1876, Williams, Thomas and Dower of Brentford put on the market certain azo-dyes which had been made in their works by Dr O. N. Witt, now one of the professors of chemistry at Charlottenburg. Shortly afterwards dyes of the same class were introduced by the celebrated Baden Company at the instigation of Dr Caro. In both cases, however, the inspiration came from Dr Griess, chemist to Messrs Allsopp, of Burton-on-Trent, the discoverer of the diazo-compounds. Moreover, Dr Caro, Griess's personal friend, gained his practical experience as chemist to Roberts, Dale and Company, in Manchester. It is an open secret that Griess would have taken service with the successors of Simpson, Maule and Nicholson, had they been willing to give him an adequate salary; that Professor Dewar, who now enjoys a distinguished reputation on account of his extraordinary originality and skill as a manipulator, was equally ready to join them; and that Caro would not have left England had he seen any prospect in remaining. English manufacturers simply gave away their chances. The field of the azo-dyes proved to be a most fruitful one. It was explored in every direction in the laboratories of the German works; and hundreds of patents were taken out in consequence. We had thrown away our chance of competing on anything like equal terms against such wisely directed efforts. But the boom did not set in until long after Hofmann left us. If our manufacturers had given the slightest encouragement to chemists, if they had been willing to employ them and to pay them properly, genius would have been attracted to the work. Our failure was due to the fact that our manufacturers, although business men, so-called, knew nothing of science and had no sympathy with it. The case on behalf of Germany, on the other

hand, cannot be better put than in the words used by Dr Witt in reporting to his government as German commissioner at the Chicago Exhibition in 1893:—

‘What appears to me to be of far greater importance to German chemical industry than its predominant appearance at the Columbian World’s Show is the fact, which finds expression in the German exhibits alone, that industry and science stand on the footing of deepest mutual appreciation, one ever influencing the other. By affording proof that this is truly the case, Germany has given an indisputable guarantee of the vitality of its chemical industries.’

Almost every line of the Report of the Technical Education Board affords proof that the appreciation of science by manufacturers, here referred to as operative in Germany, has been non-existent in England. The statement made by Professor Dewar to the Sub-committee, that ‘there is no doubt that this coal-tar colour industry could have been maintained here had manufacturers adopted the same principles as in Germany and had written off, say 10,000*l.* a year for the purpose of research work,’ undoubtedly expresses the opinion of those who have studied the problem in all its bearings.

How shall we account for the difference between ourselves and Germany? Why are manufacturers there appreciative of science? Why had Liebig so abiding and extensive an influence in his own country, so limited an influence here? His great work consisted in starting and developing a new industry—that of experimental scientific research; probably no other single man has done so much to promote the industry of brain development. The example he set at Göttingen spread to all the German universities. But he was successful because the seed fell on fruitful soil. The ground had been prepared more particularly by Wilhelm von Humboldt, who, when Prussian Minister of Education in 1810–12, established a state examination for all schoolmasters and developed the school-leaving examination (*abiturientenexamen*). In this country, be it remarked, the registration of teachers has only just been arranged for and is not in any way compulsory; we have no school-leaving examination. Liebig appealed to an educated and teachable nation—to a nation in which the universities were in touch with the people,

willing to listen to and learn from experts and believing in organisation; moreover, to a nation enjoying no excess of prosperity. Not so here. But it will be said that his influence was felt here—that experimental scientific research has been carried on all over the country and at the universities. Yes, but sporadically, not systematically, as in Germany; by amateurs rather than by professionals, and from a different point of view. The German universities have systematically trained their students in research work; graduation has involved for all students the production of a thesis giving evidence of original enquiry. The German universities have long sought to teach their students how knowledge is acquired and how to extend the boundaries of knowledge. Our universities have made no such demands; graduation in this country has only involved proof that certain knowledge has been acquired; research, if carried on at all, has hitherto been a post-graduate exercise. The result is that the German public know what research is and that the British public do not; that Germany has gradually trained up an army of competent scientific workers, whilst we have allowed but a few volunteers to equip themselves here and there. It has not been a question of the mere existence of schools; both nations have had the schools; and we have shown that ours can be as effective as the German; it is a question of the use made of the schools. Our break-down is traceable therefore to the attitude adopted at our universities; and unless we can change this we shall make little progress.

But it is not only the universities that have been lacking. The German manufacturers have helped themselves to an extraordinary degree by establishing schools of research—true technical schools—within their works. And the great demand for competent workers has had its effect upon the universities; demand has created supply; the professors have been able to count upon placing their pupils; and consequently students have been encouraged to become qualified scientific workers. Here the average university product has never appealed to the manufacturer; and one reason is that, as stated above, it has not been prepared with a view to his service. It is a striking fact that in Germany progress has been greatest in the industry most closely affected by Liebig's labours—in the

field of organic chemistry, which affords extraordinary scope for the highest flights of scientific imagination. Industries of a more settled character, giving less scope for expansion, have benefited at a much later stage, although the example set in applying science to industry in the colour works has gradually spread to all branches of manufacture in Germany.

But we must not overrate the effects produced by disregard of science: other powerful influences, perhaps, however, traceable to the same origin, are at work. According to the Report of the Technical Education Board 'the glass industry has suffered from the inability of manufacturers to appreciate the value of science, from want of touch with scientific institutions, and especially from the want of an institution similar to the Physical Institute at Charlottenburg (Reichsanstalt). The recently established National Physical Laboratory, will, it is hoped, now fulfil this want.'

This statement of the causes at work retarding the industry referred to overlooks the fact that, apart from the difficulties arising from the attitude of its trade union, lack of enterprise has much to do with its backward condition. Hitherto we have manufactured only soft glass, i.e. bottle and window glass and lead glass; hard glass, such as is used for chemical operations, for which there is now a very large and rapidly growing demand, is all imported from abroad. At any moment its manufacture might have been introduced into England: in Germany the manufacture is in no way dependent on the existence of the Reichsanstalt; and its absence here has certainly not been due to the want of a similar institution. The main cause of our abstention is probably to be found in the peculiar unwillingness which English manufacturers have long displayed to undertake work except on a large scale. The German has always been willing to meet the wishes of almost any customer, however small. He is now reaping the advantage; things which have had small beginnings have frequently proved to have great ends. The fact remains that the material which perhaps is the most important of all others to the scientific worker—hard glass—is not made here; and this may not be without significance as an illustration of our general disregard of scientific method.

As regards the electrical industry, there is something to be said in excuse of our comparative backwardness. The cause that pushed us to the front in the matter of ocean telegraphy failed us here. Having felt the need of communicating with the world outside, we set about accomplishing this; but we were fairly well provided with light by the gas companies; and, as the public had invested their money freely in such enterprises, pecuniary considerations hindered the development of electric lighting. In America by far the simplest way of lighting towns not previously provided with a gas service—of which there were very many—was to introduce electricity; and electric traction was also easily introduced into cities having wide streets not congested with traffic as ours are, especially as there was no prejudice against high speeds and the attendant risk to life. Much can be done where the doctrine of the greatest good of the greatest number really prevails. In Switzerland, again, the adaptability of water-power to the generation of electricity naturally led to its adoption at an early stage. Still, notwithstanding the slowness with which electrical appliances have been introduced here, English workers have done their full share towards perfecting them. The late Dr Hopkinson, to mention only one name, was in the very front rank of contemporary electricians. Being fully persuaded of the value of science to industry, the Germans have naturally provided well-equipped schools for teaching electricity; but it is doubtful whether, after all they have done in this way, their electricians are in advance of ours. There is too much tendency in these days to worship equipment and the mere number of students; the quality of the article turned out is not sufficiently taken into consideration.

There cannot be the least doubt, however, that many important industries have failed or are failing in this country because—to use the words of the Report of the Technical Education Board—‘of the lack of scientific training of the manufacturers themselves and their consequent inability to recognise the importance of scientific assistance.’ But we must be careful to put the right interpretation on the term scientific training. It is not to be interpreted as meaning that the leaders of industry should be scientific experts but rather that they should be suffi-

ciently acquainted with scientific principles and methods to be aware of the value of science in industry. As Professor Flemming, one of the witnesses before the Subcommittee, said :—

‘The successful captain of industry is not a man with an intimate knowledge of the facts or laws of chemistry or electricity, but a man with that right commercial instinct, good judgment, prevision, and, above all things, a knowledge and power of appreciating men and putting the right man in the right place. . . . I think, therefore, that the view which should be pressed forward is that the *leaders* required in our scientific industries are not primarily scientific specialists, or what are commonly called scientific men, but men with business experience, having, however, a keen appreciation of the nature of the scientific problems to be solved in keeping ahead in the struggle for commercial supremacy. Men of this stamp will call for, and will obtain, the assistance of purely scientific investigators in solving commercial problems. . . . What the British manufacturer really lacks is want (*sic*) of common-sense and business acumen; as a rule he has great faith in the power of advertisements but little in the utility of scientific assistance. In my opinion the backward state of some of our electrical industries is due to the fact that their leaders and owners have not sufficient belief in the advantages to be gained from bringing expert scientific assistance to bear on the improvement of their processes. They are content to go along in old grooves, and think the expenditure required for scientific assistance a useless extravagance’ (p. 16).

We are thus brought back to consider the problem from the point of view of the economist. Primarily, it is the so-called man of business who is out of his depth in our country at the present day; and, until he is made aware of his narrowness and led to respect the engineer, it will be impossible for industry and science to stand on ‘a footing of deepest mutual appreciation, one ever influencing the other.’ If this be a necessary condition of success—and there scarcely can be a doubt that it is—it is imperative that some action should be taken, similar to that of the Admiralty, affecting the nation as a whole, not the navy only.

Our defective system of general and secondary education, including university training, is now almost universally held to be the primary cause of our failure. As

regards the manufacture of intelligence, we are obviously in much the same position as in regard to the manufacture of dyes; we have, so to speak, let both industries fall into decay. It will not be easy to recover our position: the task to be undertaken is a very heavy one, as our scholastic factories need to be organised afresh and work carried on in them with a more carefully selected staff and on a scale and with appliances adequate to meet modern requirements. The passing of the Education Act of 1902 will make it possible to co-ordinate the various branches of educational work—a step of great importance; but, unless care be taken, the schools will continue to apply pedantic and discredited methods. The men who will have control of education, however sympathetic, have little or no expert knowledge of the subject. School Boards have proved to demonstration that education may suffer while theoretically it is being promoted. They have done much to popularise education: under their auspices liberal provision has been made of commodious and well-ventilated buildings; but the opinion is widely held that the training given under their direction is, to a large extent, unpractical and ill adapted to turning out good citizens and effective workers. Until our schools are properly officered by men and women with a clear understanding of the requirements, living in the present and looking towards the future, there can be little improvement. Teachers are to the school and therefore to the nation what officers are to the ship and to the navy: there should be a public aim and policy in national education. The fundamental proposition in both cases should be that complete preparation must be given for the work to be done. The sailor is taught to manœuvre and to fight his ship, although fighting is with him only an occasional matter. The nation has to fight, not only occasionally but always, for its daily existence; and yet there is no proper drill for the purpose; its officers are not consciously trained to drill it; even the elements of the drill are not yet laid down and accepted.

The fault rests with the central authority rather than with the School Boards. The central authority has failed to lead, if it has not misled, the schools. But it in turn has been the victim of the universities and of the unpractical

methods these have adopted. How different the German attitude! The Germans admittedly owe their success to their universities. As already pointed out, one guiding principle affects the German universities and distinguishes them from ours: throughout their career their students are taught to look forward, to aim at extending the boundaries of knowledge. This scientific spirit is now implanted in the nation; and the man of commerce can in consequence appreciate the scientific worker and values his services. Until we adopt a similar policy, until we trust the teacher and make education a matter of deepest concern to the State, there can be little progress; unless we realise that examinations such as are now popular among us spell ruin, that they in every way encourage a wrong attitude towards learning, there can be no true teaching; for true teaching is possible only where there is full freedom and where the interest of the learner is excited.

In the Report of the Sub-committee of the Technical Education Board, much is said that is both interesting and important with reference to the training to be given in the secondary schools and at the university. The Sub-committee refer with just pride to the influence the Board has had in improving the character and efficiency of the scientific training given in the London secondary schools. The Report of the Board for 1901-1902, in which the work done since 1893 is summarised, is full of interest from this point of view, as it shows how much of importance has been accomplished by the Board in furtherance of technical education. It is to be hoped that, in the near future, the Board will be able, in conjunction with the new educational authority, to carry out the improvements it foreshadows; and that practical scientific studies will then receive their full and due share of attention in all London schools, not merely in the interest of those who will subsequently pursue similar higher studies, but of the community at large, in order that all branches of commerce and industry may stand on that footing with science of 'mutual deepest appreciation' which the times imperatively demand.

In discussing the need for the further development of advanced technology in London, the Technical Education Board is dealing with a very difficult question. Here again

some misapprehension appears to prevail. The Technical High School at Charlottenburg (Berlin) is spoken of as though it was something altogether special. Mr Haldane makes particular reference to it; Mr Sidney Webb, writing on the University of London in the 'Nineteenth Century' for June 1902, tells us that what is wanted is, to put it briefly, a British Charlottenburg; and Lord Rosebery has recently appeared as the advocate of a similar view. It is easy for well-disposed advisers like Mr Webb to offer a big building as a solution of our difficulties; but it may be doubted whether we should be much better off if we had one; at all events, the case should be very carefully worked up by those who are real judges of the requirements before any final step is taken. Let us for once act so as to get rid of the reproach that we are a nation of amateurs. Let us be careful not to make—as in the case of the army reforms of a past generation—a mere blind and unintelligent copy of institutions successful elsewhere but possibly not suited to ourselves.

It does not seem to be understood that, in so far as its work is different from that of the university, the Berlin High School is merely a great engineering school in which all the students of the ordinary engineering subjects in Berlin are collected together. There are more of these students in Berlin than there are in London; and subjects, such as architecture, which, to our discredit, are not thoroughly taught here, have much attention paid to them in Berlin. Naval architecture is a specially favoured subject. In London, engineering, as ordinarily understood, and electrical engineering are taught during the day in four distinct colleges, and in a still larger number of colleges in the evening; and, what is more, the teaching in these subjects is of a far more practical character than that given at Charlottenburg.

The problem we have to solve is this—shall these various engineering colleges continue to exert their separate and unorganised activities, or shall there be some reorganisation so as to bring about the co-ordination of the provision for the highest grades of education which the Sub-committee of the Technical Education Board speak of as the greatest need of London at the present time? There can be no doubt that the latter is the only course to pursue if we are to follow true scientific methods.

To give one or at most two professors and a few assistants charge of any one of the great branches of study at the present day is simply farcical. The result of this starving process is that the English professor is a kind of maid-of-all-work; and the teaching of any subject in its higher branches is in consequence conducted with the greatest difficulty. Research work can only be done effectively when attention can be concentrated upon it; it cannot be done in odd moments by distracted minds.

The problem is one which concerns not only London but the country at large. After long doing little or nothing for technical education, we are establishing schools all over the country which in too many cases are mere copies the one of the other. It would be far better if more local colour were given to such colleges, if subjects of first-rate importance were provided for, in as complete a manner as possible, in a limited number of the most suitable localities. The argument applies as well to universities as to colleges.

The amount of talent at our disposal for teaching any particular subject is but limited; and a few schools, each containing a sufficient number of first-rate men supervising and directing the work of a well trained junior staff, would be far better than a large number of schools in charge of second-rate men with a body of poorly paid, comparatively inefficient, and overworked assistants. Although it is undoubtedly to the convenience of students to have colleges widely distributed—and in the case of evening students almost indispensable—the gain is in no way sufficient to compensate for the consequent necessary loss of efficiency.

In London, to take the case of electrical engineering as an example, it would be far better to amalgamate the existing colleges into one or, at the most, two; and even in the latter case the two should be organised specially to take up different main branches of the subject. Civil and mechanical engineering, in like manner, would benefit greatly if the several main branches into which the subject is divisible were centralised in separate fully equipped schools. Chemistry, physics, and other branches both of physical and of biological science requiring separate treatment would profit equally, if centralised. Not only would students of any given subject, who are now

distributed in various colleges, have the advantage of the advice of a number of men, each specially qualified in some particular branch of the subject; they would also be brought into association with a far larger number of other students and would gain much from intercourse with colleagues some of whom would have interests allied to, while others would have interests different from, their own.

But there are deeper problems underlying engineering education which must be solved if we wish to make it really efficient. It is not only a question of providing buildings and equipment; questions of method are of paramount importance and need far more attention than they have received hitherto. When mechanical engineering became a subject of collegiate instruction, and practical work was made a part of the course, this took the form of workshop instruction. Machines such as were in use in the engineer's shop were introduced; and students learnt to use these much as they would have done had they been working as apprentices; in other words, the workshop was introduced into and, in fact, became the laboratory. In addition, arrangements were made for testing the strength of materials and for engine and boiler trials. The principles of the profession were taught by means of lectures and at the drawing-board. Although trained in this way to be an exact worker, the engineer can scarcely be said to have been sufficiently trained to be a thoughtful and observant scientific worker; the tendency has been to lead him to follow precedent rather than to be critical and develop new ideas; he has enjoyed few, if any, of the opportunities that the student of physical science has of becoming acquainted with methods of research. The tendency to theorise has been almost repressed; in fact it has been somewhat the boast of the engineer that he has been severely practical. We are beginning to see, now that theory is playing so great a part in practice, that the British engineer, to maintain his place, must have a far more complete command of theory than heretofore; that his mental attitude must be a very different one in future. He must not only aim at being constructive: in order that he may be constructive, in order that he may appreciate the requirements of practice and be able to formulate his wants, he must cultivate a seeing eye, an analytic

habit of mind. As a student, therefore, he must be continually practised in solving problems. If this point of view be accepted, the method of instruction must undergo radical changes. Instead of merely using machines, the meaning of every part, of every operation, must be carefully worked out. Work such as the mere mechanic does, although valuable in its way, must occupy an altogether subordinate place; it must not usurp the place of work which is truly experimental.

Another great want among engineers is that mathematics should be taught usefully: not by academic methods but in such manner that a serviceable knowledge of the subject may be acquired. There can be little doubt that this will be accomplished only when the experimental work done in the laboratory is intimately linked with the mathematical teaching. So long as the subjects are separately taught by teachers having no common aim, there will be little progress; and engineers will continue to feel that the less they have to do with mathematics the better. However much time they are forced to give to the study of the subject at college, they will, after leaving, rapidly put aside as useless nearly all they have learnt, and will degenerate into mere users of formulæ, because the true value and the true use of mathematics will not have been brought home to them.

If views such as these prevail, a very different equipment must be introduced into our engineering colleges, in order that students may be in a position to engage constantly in engineering research. The erecting shop, which plays so important a part in engineering works, will have its equivalent in the college, so that, whenever necessary, new arrangements of apparatus or new machines may be fitted up which are appropriate to the investigation in hand at the moment. The engineering department of the magnificent new Municipal Technical School in Manchester may be referred to as a warning against the danger of merely following existing precedents in establishing such schools. This school is equipped with every possible machine, the wealth of appliances being simply overwhelming; indeed, so much is this the case, that there is not sufficient room left in which students can work. The mistake is all the greater because students who could take advantage of such appli-

ances are not at present forthcoming—and are not likely to be so for years to come—in numbers sufficient to justify such an expenditure. Meanwhile the machinery provided will probably become antiquated. The engineer, to be successful in the future, must not be trained under such conditions but must be brought up to think for himself and to help himself in every possible way on every possible occasion. And this argument is applicable to every branch of technical education. Moreover, we are prepared in this country to work on such lines. However conservative most of the present leaders may be, there is a very strong progressive undercurrent among the younger men. The introduction of technical education has meant here what it has not yet meant elsewhere—the introduction of novel methods which are in opposition to the academic methods of the old schools; and nothing short of a revolution is taking place. This is affecting all our technical educational work. In every branch of technical instruction principles are being taught, not didactically but more and more through their applications; the student is being trained to dig out the principles underlying operations; and theory and practice are fast becoming inseparable companions.

The training of mechanical engineers has attracted attention of late, having been much discussed in connexion with the important report made for Mr Yarrow by Professor Dalby on the methods adopted in the United States. But the discussion has turned almost entirely on the question whether and to what extent training in works should be associated with that given in the college; the fact that the college training needs to be modified in essential particulars has not been dwelt upon. Much may be said in favour of a 'sandwich system'; the difficulty is to decide what shall be the character of the sandwich. Some would prefer that half the year should be spent in college, half in works; others that a year, say, should be spent in the one and a year in the other. The problem is clearly one which will be best solved by experiment. Should it be decided that some part of the time shall be spent in works, there will at once be an opportunity of reconsidering the character of the college course and of introducing improvements which will make it far more effective as a training in scientific method

and as preparation for work in the world; in any case, it is important that this consideration should be more fully borne in mind than it has been in the past. Moreover, it will also be necessary to consider whether technical education shall be allowed entirely to mask the general education of the prospective engineer; whether it be not all-important that he should have some literary training and some acquaintance with biological science.

Since this article was in type Sir Norman Lockyer has made a powerful appeal to the public, which his scientific colleagues will all desire to support in principle. But probably most will feel that for some time to come we shall do well to develop and improve existing universities rather than add to the number, and that, in the first place, we need to consider and formulate anew the tactics of education and to enforce the general adoption of a system in harmony with the times: there will be little remunerative outlay of fresh funds until this be done. Sir Norman Lockyer's address should do much to promote the necessary revision.

From whatever point of view we regard our position, it is clear that we have much leeway to make up; but it is the nation at large that needs training, not any one section of it. Unless a proper foundation be laid it is impossible to build a sound superstructure; the greater part of the training given by our technical schools at the present day is ineffective because of the insufficient preparation given in the secondary schools; both must be improved if either is to do its work in a satisfactory manner. This year is the centenary of Liebig's birth. Much has been written of his work and of its value, but nowhere has sufficient stress been laid on the influence he exercised in making experimental research an integral factor of university and industrial life; this, we think, is the crowning service he rendered to his country. But even in Germany classical tradition has held the schools in its bonds. Liebig's influence has not yet reached the German schools. Scientific ideals, therefore, still prevail only as an upper current in Germany; and the dominance of militarism must tend to delay their spread. Herein lies our opportunity.

HENRY E. ARMSTRONG.

Art. VIII.—MACEDONIA AND THE POWERS.

1. *Sir A. Henry Layard, G.C.B., D.C.L. Autobiography and Letters.* Edited by the Hon. William N. Bruce; with a chapter on his parliamentary career by the Right Hon. Sir Arthur Otway. Two vols. London: Murray, 1903.
2. *The Life of Midhat Pasha.* By his son, Ali Haydar Midhat Bey. London: Murray, 1903.
3. *Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of South-Eastern Europe.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of his Majesty. March and April, 1903. (Cd. 1467 and Cd. 1532.)

THERE is always a peculiar fascination in the story of a man's life when told by himself. The interest of the story is particularly engrossing if the hero happens to be an individual whose deeds and character were already widely known to the world. The autobiography before us affords a good example of the kind of pleasure that can only be derived from a happy combination of those seemingly contradictory sources—notoriety and novelty. Sir Henry Layard's name has long been familiar to us; the fruits of his manifold activity in the fields of archæology, diplomacy, and art have long been public property; and yet the present volumes offer much that will be new even to the most diligent reader of 'Nineveh and its Remains,' 'Early Adventures in Persia, Babylonia, and Susiana,' and other works by the same gifted pen. The chapters dealing with the author's life at Constantinople during the brilliant epoch of Sir Stratford Canning's embassy in that capital, and his personal relations with the great ambassador, possess special interest at this moment when the hoary Eastern Question seems on the point of once more attracting the world's attention to the City of the Sultans. In these chapters the student will find the beginning of many of the threads that make up this Penelope's web of incessant intrigue and suffering; and, as in these records of sixty years ago he discovers much that sounds like an echo of the newspapers and Blue-books of to-day, he will realise more vividly than ever the continuity of history. The East still is the unchanging East; and of all parts of the East none has changed less than Macedonia.

In 1843, as in 1903, the Christian population of that luckless province complained of the Turkish governor's rule as 'arbitrary and oppressive.' Then, as now,

'brigandage prevailed, and the country in general was insecure in consequence of the political agitation which had already commenced amongst the Christian populations of Roumelia, mainly caused by the intrigues of Russian agents.'

Sir Henry continues:

'One of the objects of my mission was to enquire into the movement which was alleged to be in progress amongst the Bulgarians, and the means by which it was brought about. Secret societies were known to exist, which had for their object to excite an insurrection against the Turkish Government, and which were directed and supported by secret Committees in Russia and by Russian agents. There had already been more than one attempt at rebellion, which had been suppressed by the Turkish troops. However, at that time, the Bulgarians formed but a small minority of the Christian population of Macedonia and of Salonica, its capital, and being of the Greek faith were included by the Turkish authorities amongst the Greeks.' (Vol. ii, p. 24.)

Here we have a partial summary of the situation which confronts the statesmen of Europe at the present hour. The 'movement,' whose birth Sir Henry chronicles, is the infant which has since grown to the gigantic dimensions of the Macedonian agitation. This movement, originated by the political intrigue of 'Committees in Russia'—no longer secret—and fostered by 'arbitrary and oppressive government,' has gradually succeeded in bringing under its influence, by fair means and foul, a large portion of the Christian inhabitants 'but a small minority' of whom were at that time known as Bulgarian. The steps by which this result has been attained, and the various phases of the policy in which the movement originated, have already (April 1903) formed the subject of a sketch in this Review. Further light on the progress of the agitation and its sources, internal as well as external, is thrown by the recently published 'Life of Midhat Pasha,' an able book which brings the record of Turkey's troubles down to the year 1881, and from that point of view may be regarded as a sequel and a supplement to Sir Henry's

'Autobiography.' Here we shall endeavour to follow the story in its latest developments.

For the last few years the approach of spring has been invariably accompanied by attempts at insurrection on the part of the Bulgarian population of Macedonia, assisted by bands of invaders from Bulgaria, under the leadership of officers of the Bulgarian army. These attempts, though generally ending in failure, have, year after year, grown more persistent in their recurrence and more extensive in their scope. This fact alone would suffice to prove that they were not the outcome of isolated and spontaneous action on the part of the distressed peasantry, but the results of a well-matured plan, the object of which has consistently been to force Europe to interest itself in the fate of Macedonia, and to bestow upon its inhabitants an independence which they could not achieve by their own efforts.

In pursuance of this end there has gradually been established in Macedonia a secret administration with far-reaching ramifications—an administration as powerful as the government and more dreaded, owing to the mystery of its proceedings and the irresponsible character of its agents. In the parts of the province inhabited by a homogeneous Bulgarian peasantry, the movement was from the first received with comparative favour; but in the far larger districts occupied by a mixed or by a non-Bulgarian population, it has always met with opposition, which necessitates frequent recourse to murder and intimidation. The Committee's organs have been industrious in preaching to all Macedonians the gospel of freedom and brotherhood. Nay, they have even attempted to secure the support, or at all events the neutrality, of the Turks themselves through circulars addressed to the Turkish notables, in which the insurrection is described as having for its sole object to obtain a more humane administration, by which both Mohammedans and Christians will profit alike.

It is needless to say that the movement never had the slightest chance of meeting with any sympathy, or even toleration, on the part of the Mohammedans, who see in it, naturally, nothing but a conspiracy against their own privileges. But there is no *a priori* reason why it should

not have been welcomed by the other Christians who, in common with the Bulgarians, have suffered for five centuries from the effects of the worst rule that has ever brought shame on the name of government. As a matter of fact, so long as the agents of the Macedonian Committee confined themselves to such declarations, and so long as their actions were not too flagrantly at variance with their professions, they were readily seconded by those simple villagers who, having no distinct national aspirations of their own, hailed the Bulgarian agitators as the apostles of emancipation, especially when the promises of future prosperity were accompanied with the 'removal' of local oppressors, such as tyrannical beys and rural guards—the secular scourges of the country districts. But some three years ago the Committee, actuated partly by the desire to profit by the humiliation of Greece and the diminution of her prestige in Macedonia, partly by the conviction that the time had come to reap the fruits of their labour, assumed an attitude the reverse of conciliatory, and adopted tactics which lost it the goodwill of many sympathisers.

It began a truceless war of extermination against the Patriarchist party, which includes all the Greeks, most of the Wallachs, and a large portion of the Bulgarian-speaking peasants who, no matter what their racial origin is, persist in regarding themselves as Greeks, and, thanks to their staunch adherence to the Greek cause, have earned the undying hatred of their Exarchist neighbours and the appellation of Greco-maniacs. The Committee's bands would invade a village on some feast-day, surround the church and, at the point of the bayonet, compel all the villagers to sign a document declaring their wish to join the Exarchic fold, and to denounce the Patriarch and the Greek nation. Recalcitrant priests, schoolmasters, and notables were mercilessly tortured and murdered; and a reign of terror was inaugurated. Many of the victims of this persecution took the first opportunity of revenging themselves by informing the Turkish authorities against their oppressors. These apostates were stigmatised as traitors to the cause, and were punished with death. The motive of these atrocious tactics is to extend the Bulgarian influence over the whole of the territory allotted to Bulgaria by the Treaty

of San Stefano. The extortion of written confessions of faith from the Orthodox peasantry has for its object to enable the Bulgarian Exarch to obtain from the Sultan new bishoprics, and spread his spiritual jurisdiction over new districts, so that, when the opportune moment comes, he may claim the whole province as Bulgarian.

This is the dark side of the revolutionary movement—a side frequently overlooked by those who, blinded by religious or nationalist enthusiasm, see in the action of the Bulgarians nothing but the struggle of a Christian people against Mohammedan misrule, forgetting that, while struggling for their own freedom, the Bulgarians strive to deprive others of their national existence. The claims of sentiment are great; those of humanity and historic truth are greater still. Regard for these very claims induces us to admit that, in so far as the Committee has honestly acted on behalf of a down-trodden people, it has deserved well of all lovers of justice and freedom. Furthermore, the power of combination and the tenacity of purpose displayed by the organisers of the movement, as, with infinite patience, perseverance, and secrecy, they pushed from hamlet to hamlet, would entitle them to a high degree of admiration were it not that these admirable qualities have throughout been equalled by a cold-blooded cruelty and a cynical unscrupulousness such as are rarely found even in revolutionary movements.

The train being thus laid, the engineers of the agitation in Bulgaria and Macedonia often and loudly proclaimed their intention to apply the match which was to set fire to the mine. These threats, as time went by, lost much of their terror by frequent repetition. Those intimately acquainted with the situation have always been inclined to treat the Committee's periodical announcements of an impending 'general rising' as empty bombast, maintaining that such a rising is impossible, owing, first, to the notorious want of homogeneity and concord among the Christian inhabitants of Macedonia, and secondly, to their helplessness in view of the numerous Mohammedan population, which, in co-operation with the Sultan's troops, would be quite capable of strangling any insurrectionary attempt at its birth. The only thing that the Committee could really bring about was, in the

opinion of experts, more extensive and vigorous action on the part of the rebel bands, which, reinforced from Bulgaria, might, with proper leading and some proficiency in the use of firearms, turn the splendid opportunities for guerrilla warfare offered by Macedonia to some account; or it might, by deliberate outrages committed upon the Mohammedans, provoke retaliatory massacres, which would stir up a storm of horror and indignation in Christian Europe and force the Powers to intervene. This forecast of the situation has been amply confirmed by recent events.

The present year opened with the usual predictions of coming trouble, rendered more credible than usual by the uncommonly prolonged activity which the revolutionary bands had evinced during the whole of the preceding twelve months. In order to avert the possible consequences of such an emergency, the European Powers had already made repeated efforts to impress upon the Sultan the urgent need of introducing such administrative reforms as would ameliorate the condition of the Macedonian population and thus deprive the agitators of their *raison d'être* and of the sympathies of the peasantry. The Sultan in last November appointed a commission; and a programme of reforms was drawn up, which, however, competent and not unfriendly critics pronounced 'palpably insufficient.' Thereupon the two Powers most nearly concerned in the future of European Turkey undertook to elaborate a scheme of their own, which was endorsed by all the signatories to the Treaty of Berlin, and, through their joint pressure, was promptly accepted by the Sultan—all the more promptly as it was essentially a copy of his own scheme, only more limited in scope. Whereas the programme of the Porte provided for the improvement of all the European provinces of the empire, the Austro-Russian plan was confined to the three vilayets which, absurdly enough, are known under the collective name of 'Macedonia.'

No impartial observer can avoid admitting that in theory, at all events, the Sultan's spontaneous scheme had the advantage over that drawn up by the two Powers. Why make invidious distinctions between the so-called Macedonian and the other vilayets? The need for re-

form is as pressing in Thrace, Albania, and Epirus, as in 'Macedonia.' Nay, further, the Sultan's subjects, Moham-medan as well as Christian, suffer from the same abuses and exactions in every part of his dominions, European, Asiatic, and African alike. But there are no Macedonian committees in those provinces. Besides, it appears that the two Powers preferred to limit the scope of their intervention in order to emphasise their exclusive interest in a particular portion of the Ottoman empire, and so to avoid the co-operation of the Powers interested in other parts of the same empire. At all events, the joint effort of the two Powers, thanks to its very limitations, proved acceptable both to the other Powers and to the Porte; so much so, that the unanimous approval of it by the former and its rapid adoption by the Sultan were hailed by its authors as a diplomatic triumph of an unprecedented character—and an empty diplomatic triumph it has remained.

It was at once recognised that an essential condition for the success of the plan was that its execution should be hindered neither by any procrastination on the Sultan's part, nor by revolutionary action on the part of the Macedonian Committee and its abettors in the neighbouring Principality. The first of these dangers was provided against by the energetic steps taken by the ambassadors of the great Powers at Constantinople, who informed the Sultan that upon his honest determination to carry out his promises, even at the eleventh hour, depended the continuance of his rule in Europe. The Sultan gave another proof of his reputed sagacity by appreciating the force of the argument—and of the excuse which it afforded him for laying the blame of possible complications at the door of his enemies—and readily pledged himself to do everything in his power to ensure the application of the reforms. Whether he meant to keep his word or not is a question as unprofitable as it is indelicate to discuss. The point that possesses a deeper interest for the impartial historian is that, whatever the Sultan's inmost thoughts may have been, he was not allowed an opportunity of translating them into action. The second condition for a fair trial of the reforms—the abeyance of the revolutionary movement—was found unattainable.

The Powers, while extracting from the Sultan his

acquiescence in their plan, brought at the same time all their influence to bear in order to restrain the activity of the agitators. This was the main motive of Count Lamsdorff's journey to Sofia last December; and the Russian minister's efforts were vigorously seconded by the representatives of the other Powers. So far as official Bulgaria is concerned, these efforts were not entirely fruitless. Prince Ferdinand's advisers were convinced that Russia was seriously anxious to avoid for the time being all complications in the Balkans, and that, if they ventured to embark on a perilous policy, they would be left to face the tempest alone. The result of this conviction was that the revolutionary Committees in the Principality were suppressed; their leaders were arrested, and precautions were taken to guard the frontier against invasion of the Turkish territory.

These measures were followed by a circular addressed by the Bulgarian government to its agents in Macedonia, instructing them to discountenance all revolutionary proceedings, and categorically to declare to all whom it might concern that 'if the prudent advice of the Prince's government be disregarded, nobody will have a right to count upon Bulgaria.' In fact, everything was done, as the Bulgarian Premier said, 'to convince foreign countries that the Principality is not a nursery of disorders in the Peninsula.' But it was too late. Notwithstanding Prince Ferdinand's endeavours, things continued their fatal course. The truth is that, although the action of the Bulgarian government achieved the end in view, namely, to show the deference due to the Tsar's wishes, to revive confidence in the loyalty of official Bulgaria, and to throw the whole responsibility for future events upon the shoulders of Turkey—it had small effect upon the revolutionary movement. The Principality had too long been 'a nursery of disorders' to be suddenly turned into a nest of peace. The agitation had already struck too deep roots; it had been too long prepared and too steadily encouraged, both in Bulgaria and in Macedonia, to be restrained by diplomatic menaces. The Committees, officially suppressed, pursued their work in secret. The leaders who were arrested one day were allowed to escape the next. Sarafoff, the soul of the movement, was not arrested at all, but at the time was in Macedonia

giving the finishing touches to his work; and the attitude even of the moderate section of the revolutionary Committee towards the policy of the Powers was adequately outlined by its leader, Michaelowski, who, in an interview with the representative of an Austrian journal during his temporary confinement, expressed the opinion that 'the Austro-Russian caricature reforms will only hasten the Macedonian insurrection.'

This prophecy received the fulfilment which might have been expected from the position of the prophet. Never were the rebel bands more active in Macedonia, and never were they more conspicuously reinforced by contingents and officers from across the frontier than during the months immediately following the publication of the reform programme. Encounters between Bulgarian insurgents and Turkish troops were of almost daily occurrence in every part of the country; and everything was done to goad the Turkish authorities and the Turkish population to acts of reprisal. The Turks, however, did not respond on an adequately large scale. Sporadic retaliation was, of course, indulged in on the part of the Bashi-bazouks; and the regular troops on one or two occasions dealt death and destruction to villages guilty of complicity with the insurgents. The search for arms continued in every district; and the peasants were cruelly beaten until they surrendered a sufficient number of rifles, or, far more frequently, until they paid a sufficient sum of money to the officer in command. But, on the whole, though the Turks did much to feed the irritation of the people, they abstained from such acts of vengeance as those upon which the Committee had built its hopes of European intervention.

Then came to pass the partial execution of a diabolical design, which had already been proclaimed by the revolutionaries in meetings held at Philippopolis and elsewhere—namely, the indiscriminate destruction of European property and life, which should 'render the residence of Europeans impossible, and thus force the hands of the Powers.' In pursuance of this fiendish plan several railway bridges were destroyed by dynamite; the Ottoman Bank at Salonica was blown up; a Messagéries Maritimes steamer in the harbour was set on fire; bombs were thrown into the crowded streets and cafés of the

town, and several innocent foreigners perished. Similar attacks were planned for Constantinople and other cities, but were frustrated by the authorities.

These acts of wanton barbarity, which disgraced the revolutionaries in the eyes of the civilised world, roused, as it was expected, the wrath of the Mohammedans, who, in revenge, massacred a number of Christians at Salonica and Monastir, but were prevented from wholesale slaughter, such as the Committee wanted, by the firmness and wisdom of the Turkish authorities, and by their own marvellous capacity for obeying orders.

Meanwhile, the Ottoman government found itself confronted with the incompatible tasks of suppressing the insurrectionary movement with one hand, and of satisfying the expectations of the Powers in the matter of reforms with the other—a combination of duties that would have taxed to the utmost the resources of far more resourceful statesmen than the inmates of the Sublime Porte. The rebellion necessitated continuous mobilisation; and the state of the Imperial treasury, as well as the peculations of the Imperial functionaries, forced the recruited battalions to live upon the peasantry and, by so doing, to keep the feeling of irritation alive. But, as if this were not sufficient, the inherent difficulties of the position were multiplied by other causes. The Turkish authorities, in their efforts to suppress the rebellion, have been hampered throughout by the action of the representatives of those very Powers who professed the deepest anxiety for the restoration of order. No sooner did the Turks proceed to the arrest of persons against whom they entertained strong suspicions of complicity, than the consuls of Austria and Russia hastened to secure their immediate release. It may be that the motive which dictated the steps taken by the Powers was to conciliate the discontented population; the result has been exactly the opposite. Most of the prisoners set free returned to their revolutionary plots with all the vigour inspired by thirst for revenge and the assurance of impunity, and with a strengthened belief in the Sultan's impotence. Other suppressive measures, which in any other country would have been deemed amply justified, or rather imperatively demanded, by the situation, were in Turkey scrupulously avoided, for fear of

raising the 'atrocities' outcry, ever one of the most effective shafts in the Balkan agitator's quiver.

The two Powers, in acting as they have done, were probably actuated by the apprehension lest the Porte, if allowed full liberty to restore order, might have recourse to methods which would heighten the exasperation of the Christians and force Europe to transfer its sympathies to the rebel side. Whatever their motive, the Porte was not allowed to deal with the situation in an effective manner. In these circumstances it would have been idle to expect anything but an aggravation of the crisis. During July there came a comparative respite, which was soon followed by a recrudescence of the movement in a more violent form. The bands were now swelled to their maximum force by peasants disengaged from harvest work, by Bulgarian schoolmasters and students, who joined secretly from the towns, and even by women enrolled for hospital duties. The signal of the new outbreak was the capture of Krushevo, where the rebels massacred the Turkish officials, followed by the recapture of the place by the Turks, who, in their turn, massacred the Greco-Wallachian population and destroyed their quarter. A similar tragedy on a smaller scale was enacted at Klissura, another town mainly inhabited, not by Bulgarians, but by Greeks and Wallachs. This coincidence seems to point to a plan in pursuance of which the insurgents selected for their operations localities peopled by the rival races, so that in case of defeat the brunt of it should be borne by the latter, while in case of victory they might be claimed as sympathisers; the result, in either case, being ruin to non-Bulgarians, whose lives and property now, more than at any former stage of the agitation, were exposed to destruction from both sides alike.

The conflagration thus begun spread in all directions. Bridges were again blown up by the insurgents, crops burnt, Mohammedan villages sacked, and their inhabitants slaughtered. The Mohammedans retaliated by the wholesale destruction of Christian villages; and at the present moment Macedonia is the scene of such horrors as are only possible in a struggle between two races in the medieval stage of development and consumed with a pent-up hatred of each other—a state of things that bids

fair to turn the country into a wilderness. This picture of the situation would be found accurate even after all deduction is made for the exaggerations purposely practised by both parties in their anxiety to paint each other's proceedings in the blackest possible colours. For both Bulgarians and Turks are past masters in the art of mendacity, and are both endeavouring, with incredible impudence, to exonerate themselves from the slightest share of blame. Thus, not long ago, there appeared simultaneously two *démentis*—one from the Bulgaro-Macedonian Committee, forwarded to St Petersburg, and the other from the Turkish embassy in London. Both documents absolutely disclaimed the cruelties and outrages with which each party was charged by the other, and each stigmatised its opponent's statements as 'malicious inventions.' Unfortunately, there is an overwhelming mass of independent evidence which, unless everybody lies except those who are interested in lying, shows that in point of savagery and wanton cruelty there is little to choose between the rebel bands and the Turkish troops.

For the moment the question is how to avoid war rather than how to provide for permanent peace; and all the resources of diplomacy are employed to prevent a rupture between Turkey and Bulgaria, that might be the cause of a general conflagration compared with which even the *inferno* in Macedonia would be tolerable. The task of binding two states to keep the peace, when they are both convinced that war is the only solution of their differences, is difficult indeed. Notwithstanding the fairly correct attitude which the cabinet of Sofia has hitherto maintained, enough has been done, or left undone, to justify the Porte's repeated Notes to the Powers, complaining of the insufficient supervision of the Bulgarian frontier and the consequent irruption of armed bands, under Bulgarian officers, into Ottoman territory. On the other hand, the Bulgarian government, in its memorandum distributed on August 15 to the foreign representatives at Sofia, repudiates the Turkish accusations flatly, and endeavours to prove that the sole cause of the rebellion is the ill-treatment of the Christian population by the Ottoman authorities. It dwells on the repressive measures taken by it during the past few months, and concludes with the assertion that the whole

responsibility for this state of things lies with Turkey. This memorandum, almost minatory in tone, shows that there are limits even to official Bulgaria's capacity for preserving the outward decencies of diplomatic intercourse. At the same time, the Sofia cabinet is fully aware of the risks which the Principality would run in the event of war with Turkey. It takes into account Bulgaria's isolated position, the abandonment on the part of the great Powers, and the hostility of some of the small Balkan states. It realises that in the circumstances, and in view of Turkey's military strength, victory is out of the question; and, though in case of defeat there is little doubt that Bulgaria would not be suffered to pass again under Turkish rule, wise Bulgarians fear that those who would step in to turn the Turk out might remain in his stead. All these considerations induce official Bulgaria to adhere to a pacific policy. But official Bulgaria is not the only factor with which the student of the problem has to deal; and, the more carefully one examines the other factors, the less certain one becomes of official Bulgaria's ability to maintain a pacific attitude much longer.

The doings in Macedonia find a loud echo in the Principality, where the Bulgaro-Macedonian element is numerous and influential, and, being of a more demonstrative character than the native Bulgarian population, makes itself heard in a proportional degree. The army also consists largely of Macedonian Bulgarians, and many of its officers are known to be at the head of insurrectionary bands in Macedonia, while bodies of Macedonian students at Sofia are actively engaged in manufacturing the explosives which have already given so much evidence of the terrible rôle they can play in the hands of unscrupulous desperadoes. The normal influence exercised by these Macedonians is now enhanced by the presence of refugees from their native country, and by the rumours of atrocities which reach them from across the frontier. These rumours create a volume of excitement, which finds vent in largely attended requiem services, at which presiding ecclesiastics deliver stirring harangues; and in mass-meetings, at which noisy demagogues denounce the government's inaction and pass resolutions of sympathy with the struggling brethren.

Side by side with these expressions of public opinion a violent press campaign is carried on, inciting the government to declare war against Turkey.

The discontent at the government's policy is daily increasing, and so is the number of those who think that it is Bulgaria's sacred duty to succour her Macedonian kinsmen in this supreme hour of their need. In fact, the present state of public feeling in Bulgaria is not unlike that which prevailed in Greece on the eve of her unfortunate war with Turkey. Military preparations for avowedly defensive purposes were then in progress on both sides of the frontier. Neither the Sultan nor King George really wanted war; but the course of events obliged the one to seek ultimate peace at the price of a fruitless campaign, and the other to yield to popular opinion, led and inflamed by the *Ethnikè Hetairia*, as an alternative to a domestic upheaval. The same causes may again bring about similar results. Bulgaria has her *Ethnikè Hetairia* in the Macedonian Committee, an organisation in every respect far more formidable than its Greek counterpart; economically she is in a somewhat healthier condition than Greece was in 1896; her army can hardly be worse equipped than was the Greek; and its spirit, excited by passionately-worded appeals from the Macedonian Committee, is not less bellicose. Last, but not least, the war party can argue, with some air of plausibility, that there is something to gain and little to lose by defeat. Europe, which drove the Turk out of Thessaly, will never tolerate his permanent occupation of Christian territory once liberated; and, if the Cretan case may serve as a precedent, the net profit of war will probably be the emancipation of Macedonia and its future annexation to Bulgaria.

In Turkey we find a state of things even more threatening than was that preceding the last Greco-Turkish rupture. The Sultan, indeed, persuaded by his late experience that, in the event of a conflict with a Christian state, whichever side wins he is certain to lose, may be genuinely desirous of preserving the peace. But it should not be forgotten that for nearly a year he has been compelled to keep an enormous military force on a war-footing. Mobilisation and armaments entail a vast expense which, despite the Turkish soldier's proverbial

contentment with little, the Imperial treasury is incapable of sustaining much longer, the consequence being that the troops, who have been obliged to leave their fields and their families in Asia in order to be kept unpaid, unfed, and unclad in Europe, are in a most dangerous mood. The discontent of the men is shared by the officers, many of whom, young and ambitious, eagerly look forward to a campaign against Bulgaria as the high road to promotion. To these elements of unrest must be added the attitude of the large and proud Mohammedan population, which, after long and grievous provocation, has lately given unmistakable proofs of its ill-suppressed resentment. Even in official and military circles, which are less influenced by emotional and more by political considerations, the opinion is daily gaining ground that war is preferable to the present state of disastrous inaction. How long can this tension, both on the Bulgarian and on the Turkish side, continue?

If an outbreak has not yet taken place, it is entirely due to the action of the great Powers, who, fearing the dimensions which such a conflict might assume, have thrown the whole of their weight into the scale of peace. Russia, vigorously preparing for serious complications in the Far East, and anxiously watching the rapidly spreading agitation at home, is earnest in her endeavours to stave off trouble in the Near East. Hitherto she has been successful in curbing Bulgaria. Count Lamsdorff's verbal representations at Sofia, almost brutal in their severity; the Tsar's *communiqué*, in which it was explicitly stated that 'Russia would not sacrifice a single drop of the blood of her sons' if either Servia or Bulgaria should attempt to change the existing state of affairs in the Balkan Peninsula; the Russian consuls' subsequent denunciations of the revolutionary Committees and the Bulgarian agents in their reports published in the 'Official Messenger' of St Petersburg; and, above all, the moderation shown by the Tsar's government towards Turkey after the murder, within a few months, of two of its representatives, are all proofs of Russia's genuine anxiety to maintain the *status quo*. This anxiety, however, can easily be shown to be not incompatible with an equally genuine desire of keeping things in a condition favourable

to an eventual overthrow of the existing order. The Russian consuls in Macedonia, while lavishing uncomplimentary epithets upon the leaders of the rebellion, continue to pose as the champions of the Slavonic subjects of the Sultan; and, when the rebels themselves come to grief, it is through the influence of the same consuls that they are saved from the hands of the Turkish authorities. Generally speaking the Tsar's representatives in Turkey act in a manner which is construed by the agitators, not without reason, as an encouragement, and which, in proportion as it elates them, tends to irritate the Turks. It is to this cause mainly that must be attributed the recent murder of the Russian consul at Monastir.

The despatch of a squadron of the Russian Black Sea fleet to Turkish waters has added fuel to the insurrectionary movement, and proved the signal for an extension of the rebellion to the vilayet of Adrianople, where a score of villages, Greek and Mohammedan, were at once attacked and burnt by the Bulgarian bands. Crops were destroyed, telegraph wires were cut, and a passenger train was blown up—actions which justified the Turkish government in calling additional troops to the colours. On the other hand, the speedy withdrawal of the Russian fleet, coinciding as it did with this military measure on the part of Turkey, was by the Turkish people interpreted as a concession to their own power, and thus served to increase their contempt for the *giaour*. These were not exactly the results aimed at by the Tsar's government. On the contrary, Count Lamsdorff, foreseeing the construction that might be put upon the presence of the fleet by the Bulgarians, hastened to warn the Prince's ministers and the Macedonian Committees against regarding the despatch of Russian ships as an indication of a change in Russia's pacific policy in the Balkans—a warning that was corroborated by the prompt departure of the vessels as soon as the satisfaction demanded from the Sultan was obtained.

It has been conjectured, and, we think, on good grounds, that the principal object of the naval demonstration was to satisfy Panславic opinion in Russia. The 'Novoe Vremya,' the most eloquent mouthpiece of the extreme Slavophil party, hailed that step as a proof of Russia's altered attitude towards Turkey, and hastened

to assert Russia's right and duty to act independently of the other Powers in the Balkan Peninsula—assertions which, though withdrawn as promptly as the fleet, show once more the justness of the view that, however firmly official Russia may be opposed to a disturbance of the peace at the present moment, the insurgents enjoy the enthusiastic support of the Panslavist party. And here the question again arises: how long will official Russia be able to withstand the current of public enthusiasm, daily fed by reports from Macedonia? It is perfectly true that it is contrary to Russia's interests to engage in an active policy in the Near East at this moment; it is equally true that an active policy, when a passive one is more profitable and less expensive, is repugnant to the traditional principles of Russian statecraft. But popular feeling often overrules expediency; and popular feeling, when represented by such classes as those from which the Panslavist ranks are recruited, is a force that must be taken into account.

Austria's policy has hitherto been in strict accord with that pursued by Russia. The two Powers, since 1897, have acted with a common end in view, namely, the maintenance of the existing state of affairs in the Balkan Peninsula. But it is an open secret that their agreement is the outcome of sheer necessity, and goes no farther than the immediate present. Should the *status quo* be once disturbed, it is anything but certain that the partnership would survive the shock. Russia looks upon Turkey as strictly within her own exclusive sphere of influence; and, if she has consented to share that influence with her neighbour, her consent is conditional upon her immediate interests. How precarious the Austro-Russian concord is was again demonstrated by the irritation—not to say panic—which, to judge from the language of the Austrian press, the recent naval demonstration created in Vienna. Exalted Austrian circles, indeed, firmly hold the belief that, thanks to the joint representations made by the two monarchies at Sofia, a conflict between the Principality and Turkey is highly improbable; and that, even should such a conflict break out, it will remain as isolated as was the war between Turkey and Greece, involving no breach of the Austro-Russian *entente*. But these opinions, be they held as

firmly as they may, represent Austria's wishes rather than her convictions.

In the meantime Austria's attitude in Macedonia remains closely parallel to Russia's; while striving to postpone the conflagration she is not less active than her partner in keeping the embers smouldering and the fuel ready to hand for future use. But here again we find a deep current of antagonism under the superficial agreement. Whereas Russia pursues her ends by consistently upholding the Slavonic cause, Austria, wherever that cause clashes with the interests of the Albanians, lends her hearty support to these mortal enemies of the Slavs. This is the case especially in the vilayets of Kossovo and Monastir—that is, in Old Serbia and a great part of Macedonia proper. Thus, four years ago, the Austrian government supplied the money for the erection of an Albanian church at Uskub, and, through its local representative, presided over its foundation. Again, the subsequent appointment of a Russian consul at Mitrovitz, a centre of Albano-Servian strife, aroused great indignation in Austria, for he was rightly viewed as a protector of the Slavonic party; and certain incautious journals then threatened that this move would be followed by the appointment of an Austrian colleague, thus emphasising the ill-concealed rivalry between the two monarchies. In other parts of the country, however, the Austrian government is not averse from supporting the Slavs in their struggle against the Greeks, her real object being to keep the different elements divided and ready for absorption into the Austro-Hungarian empire when the time comes.

Of all the great Powers, the one that truly wishes to see the Sultan's rule in Europe and Asia prolonged is Germany. For many years past it has been Germany's endeavour to shelter the Sick Man from the blasts of adversity, and to stave off at all costs any drastic interference on the part of outsiders in the affairs of the Ottoman empire. There has been no recent crisis in the Near East which has not witnessed Germany on Turkey's side. This Turcophil policy, needless to say, springs from no sentimental source. Germany, like Austria, has no desire to help in the aggrandisement of the Slavs; and every diminution of the Sultan's prestige means an in-

crease of the Slavonic power in the Balkans. To this negative motive are added considerations of a more positive character. Turkey offers an almost unlimited field for Teutonic enterprise in many directions. The plains of Asia Minor afford a splendid receptacle for the surplus population of the Fatherland, and a profitable investment for the surplus funds of German capitalists; while every seaport, and, indeed, every important town in the Ottoman empire supplies a new market for the products of German industry.

For all these reasons, and also in view of future developments in the Mediterranean, it is Germany's interest to see that the Ottoman empire suffers no injury. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that the present crisis should be regarded with the utmost anxiety at Berlin, and that the German press should do its best to palliate the excesses committed by the Turks, while exaggerating those committed by the Bulgarians. Germany, in the opinion of German publicists, has no inducement to support movements which aim at hastening the decay of Turkey. Nevertheless, she was almost as ready as any other Power to lend her support to the Austro-Russian programme of reforms, as soon as she saw that its terms contained little that was detrimental to the Sultan's authority. This compliance, however, has not dispelled the profound suspicion of Germany entertained at St Petersburg. There are even those who hold that the Tsar's unaggressive policy in the Balkan Peninsula is as much due to his mistrust of Germany's action in the event of a Russo-Turkish conflict, as to the causes already enumerated. That Germany, in such an emergency, would go so far as to give armed assistance to her Eastern *protégé* is, in existing European conditions, very doubtful; for the present it is sufficient to note that she will certainly participate in no measures likely to humiliate or weaken the Ottoman government.

Next to Russia and Austria, Italy is the Power most nearly concerned in the drama now being acted on the Balkan stage, as any important alteration in the present territorial division will be followed by a corresponding disturbance of the equilibrium in the Mediterranean. Like Austria, Italy has chosen to befriend the Albanians; and, as the interests of the Albanians are diametrically

opposed to those of the Slavs, it follows that she can spare no sympathy for the latter. But, be her sentimental predilections and her plans for the more remote future what they may, Italy for the time being appears as reluctant as other Powers to disturb the *status quo*. Engrossed by her efforts to develop her internal resources, she cannot welcome any movement calculated to distract her attention from this useful task. Besides, in spite of her alliance with Austria, she is anxious to avoid such complications as might justify the latter Power's expansion towards Novi Bazar—an expansion all the more probable as the privilege of occupying that district with troops was theoretically granted to Austria by the Treaty of Berlin. Such a move on Austria's part would compel Italy to claim compensation in Albania; and it is by no means obvious that in so doing she would not risk a rupture with her ally.

Italy's position with regard to the Macedonian question, therefore, is one of 'loyal and harmonious co-operation with Austria-Hungary, so that neither of the two parties in the Triple Alliance should advance her interests at the expense of the other.' Such was the statement made by Sig. Alfredo Baccelli, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the Chamber of Deputies last spring; and the policy defined therein was shortly afterwards supplemented by Admiral Morin, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, who, while asserting that 'the existing understanding between Italy and Austria with regard to Albania was a sufficient guarantee that the *status quo* would be preserved,' also declared that 'in any case the Italian government would not be content with merely watching the development of affairs as an inert and passive spectator, but would know how to perform its duty and safeguard Italian interests.' That Italy means to be as good as her word is shown by Sig. Zanardelli's recent threat that 'if Austria invades Albania, Italy will immediately proceed to occupy Tripoli.' It is more clearly, if less sensationally, proved by the despatch of Italian warships, along with the Austrian, to Salonica last May, and by her recent decision to repeat the experiment, if the other Powers should do likewise.

The attitude of France towards the Macedonian question is strikingly similar to that maintained by her Russian

ally. As in Russia the extreme Panslavist party is endeavouring to force the Tsar's hand on behalf of the Bulgarian insurgents, so in France popular feeling has frequently declared itself in favour of the same cause. Last spring there were held in Paris mass-meetings under the auspices of prominent, if irresponsible, politicians, in which the deplorable condition of the Sultan's subjects was dwelt upon, and resolutions were adopted expressing the desire that the French government should take energetic action with a view to carrying into effect Articles 23 and 61 of the Treaty of Berlin, which promised better administration for Macedonia and Armenia. To these expressions of public opinion official France hastened to make a reply in which her policy of reserve was outlined and defended. M. Delcassé, Minister for Foreign Affairs, speaking to the editor of the 'Matin' (February 18), declared that, while sympathising with the popular sentiment, he was in duty bound not to expose his country to the perils of an adventurous policy, and thus incur the danger of causing offence to foreign friends, and of arousing the suspicions of foreign enemies, or 'of precipitating a conflict of which no one at the present moment can foresee the possibilities.' Such a policy as the people demanded, the Minister added, would entail 'risking the results of the labour and efforts of thirty years for a cause in which France is not, and never was, exclusively concerned.' How well founded was M. Delcassé's fear of the misconstruction to which independent action on the part of France would give rise, was soon proved by the comments of the Austrian and German journals on the Paris demonstrations. The pro-Macedonian meetings were in Vienna regarded as a possible signal for an 'atrocities' agitation, such as stirred the Christian nations of Europe in 1876, and, in any case, as a source of encouragement to the Bulgarian politicians and revolutionaries. The German press went so far as roundly to accuse France of fostering the anti-Turkish movement, and warned the Republic of the unpleasant consequences to French interests that might follow in the wake of an upheaval in Macedonia.

The fear of wounding foreign susceptibilities, and other difficulties, have induced official France to imitate the example of the other Powers in supporting the Austro-

Russian programme of reforms, as the only means of staving off a catastrophe. In coming to this decision the French government was aided by the Bulgarian agitators themselves, who, by their insensate outrages at Salonica—which affected French interests more largely than those of other Europeans—lost a great measure of French sympathy, and, for a while, the valuable advocacy of the ‘Temps,’ which, immediately after those events, discovered that the noble patriots, whom it had hitherto defended so eloquently, were after all nothing better than vulgar anarchists. This sudden change of front was perhaps partly due to the fact that Russia had by that time made it quite clear to all parties concerned that she considered the revolutionary movement inopportune.

Great Britain, prompted by the same anxious desire to postpone the inevitable which has till now inspired the policy of the other signatories to the Treaty of Berlin, was among the first to give her hearty support to the Austro-Russian plan of reforms, without, however, concealing her grave doubts as to the efficacy of that palliative, and reserving to herself the right of suggesting new measures should that plan prove inadequate. England's adhesion to the reform programme was announced in the speech from the throne at the opening of Parliament last February, and has since been reiterated by Mr Balfour and Lord Lansdowne in their respective statements. The Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in answering a question put by Lord Spencer with regard to the troubled condition of Macedonia on August 13, once more assured the House that ‘his Majesty's government would continue to watch events with anxious attention, and would do their best, so far as opportunities admitted, to mitigate these troubles.’ Mr Balfour has recently reiterated these assurances, and defended the policy of confining British policy to the support, tempered by timely suggestions, of the Austro-Russian programme, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, published in the ‘Times’ of September 26.

Now, seeing that the action initiated by Austria and Russia has failed to produce the desired effect, it would be interesting to know what are the measures which the British government contemplates recommending. But on this all-important matter, so far as official utterances

are concerned, we are at present completely in the dark. However, we have no doubt that the present government, which, as Mr Balfour's recent speech and letter show, is well informed on all the bearings of the situation in Macedonia, and all the claims involved, will pursue a course consonant alike with the best interests of this country and with those of the smaller states concerned. As to the first point, we profess our unqualified dissent from those who maintain that Great Britain is no longer interested in that part of the world; and we are at one with Lord Lansdowne in his emphatic statement, contained in a despatch to Sir F. Plunkett, dated January 6, with regard to 'the immense importance which we attach to the question, and our earnest desire to contribute, so far as our opportunities permit, to its satisfactory solution.'* But besides British interests, which give us the right to be heard in the matter, there are considerations of pure justice which render it a moral duty on the part of Great Britain to make her power felt in any settlement of the Eastern Question. These considerations arise out of the conflicting claims of the lesser nationalities involved; and we earnestly hope that England's influence, which, in spite of frequent assertions to the contrary, is still considerable in the East, will be used, on the one hand, to safeguard the small against the hardly concealed rapacity of the great, and, on the other, to prevent the small from appropriating more than their rightful share of the common heritage.

We have already dealt with Bulgaria's part in the Macedonian question. We must now cast a glance at Bulgaria's neighbours. Of these Serbia, until quite recently, had kept scrupulously aloof from the Macedonian agitation, and on more than one occasion expressed her strong disapproval of it. In fact, until last February, it was held by experienced observers that Serbia, so far from lifting a finger in support of hated Bulgaria, would eagerly take advantage of her first 'act of indiscretion,' and hasten to seek revenge for the defeat of Slivnitsa. The motive of this attitude was plain enough. The Servians, besides the regions of the vilayet of Kossovo,

* Correspondence respecting the Affairs of South-Eastern Europe (Cd. 1403), No. 358.

inhabited by people of their own race and still retaining the name of Old Servia, claim parts of Macedonia which the Bulgarians regard as belonging to the greater Bulgaria of the future. Hence a lively rivalry, which induced the Servians to thwart, so far as in them lay, a revolutionary movement conducted under Bulgarian auspices, and certain, if successful, to deprive them of their rights. The progress of this movement, however, and possibly some secret understanding with the Principality, have led to a modification of Servia's attitude. It is now felt at Belgrade that the Macedonian agitation has made too much headway for things to resume their normal state; and that the time has come to join their Bulgarian neighbours, if they wish to share in the fruits of the rebellion. Large meetings have lately been held in the Servian capital to express sympathy with the Macedonian insurgents, and resolutions carried to assist the 'brethren in Macedonia' by means of volunteers. A great quantity of arms has already been distributed for that purpose; and several bands have crossed the frontier.

This new-born spirit of sympathy grows stronger every day as reports reach the Servians of the excesses committed by the Albanians on their kinsmen in Old Servia. For a long time the disarmament of these lawless mountaineers has been anxiously demanded by the Servian government; and it was apparently in deference to Servia's just complaints that the districts in question were included in the Austro-Russian programme of reforms. This programme contained a clause providing that the Albanians should be compelled to respect the law—a clause which, as might have been foreseen, has remained a dead letter. The Sultan could not afford to offend the Albanian element, especially on the eve of a struggle with his Slavonic subjects and neighbours. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Albanians have always enjoyed Austria's secret support in their antagonism to the Servians; and their rapid progress eastwards has been in great measure aided by the dual monarchy. The consequence is that, since the publication of the reform scheme, the violence of the Albanians has become more unbearable than ever, and is likely to increase in view of the fact that things are fast developing towards a conflict between Slav and non-Slav on the one hand, and between

Christian and Mohammedan on the other. The common hatred of the Slav forms a bond of union between Christian and Mohammedan Albanians, and induces them both to support the Sultan, who is reported to have already provided them with arms.

Servia, however, distracted by a recent domestic revolution, is not likely to be of much avail to Bulgaria. Furthermore, if the latter may, to some extent, count on her Slavonic neighbour's co-operation against Turkey, this assistance is more than counterbalanced by the attitude of her other neighbour across the Danube. The Roumanians hate the Slavs quite as heartily as do the Albanians and the Greeks; and this community of feeling with the latter race brought about, in the spring of 1901, a *rapprochement* which led to a meeting between King George and King Charles at Abbazia. The prospect of a Greco-Roumanian agreement appears, however, to have been frustrated by the Greek Patriarch's inability to comply with certain demands made by the Roumanian Church in respect of the Wallachian clergy in Macedonia. Nor can this failure of the two countries to arrive at an amicable understanding surprise any one acquainted with the inner mechanism of the Roumanian propaganda in that province. Roumania, forbidden by her geographical position to entertain any aspirations to territorial expansion in that direction, seems to devote all her energies, and considerable sums of money, to the sole purpose of detaching the Wallachian population from the Greek Church and the Greek cause, thus playing into the hands of Austria, whose policy also is based on the principle of splitting up the Greek interest in Macedonia, with a view to preventing a Greco-Albanian union, which would undoubtedly retard, if not altogether impede, her southward progress to Salonica. In this policy Austria is aided by the Roumanian propaganda among the Wallachs, which, in its turn, derives no mean benefits from the Austrian representatives in the country.

The Austro-Roumanian *entente* with regard to Macedonia is only one manifestation of a far deeper and wider plan of common action, including a military convention of long standing. During the recent visit of King Charles of Roumania to the Emperor Francis Joseph at Ischl, it is said that the two monarchs discussed the possibility of

a Turco-Bulgarian quarrel, and arrived at an agreement as to their respective attitudes. It was then arranged—if the 'Vedomosti' of Sofia is well informed—that, in the event of a war, Roumania should be ready to occupy the Bulgarian territory between Silistria, Rustchuk, and Varna, in order to preserve the balance of power in the Balkan Peninsula, should Bulgaria, by a declaration of Macedonian autonomy, receive too preponderating an influence. How far this forecast of eventualities is accurate it is hardly possible to decide; but, in any case, it accords well with the known general lines of Austrian and Roumanian policy, and gains no inconsiderable credibility from the circumstance that warlike preparations are in progress in Roumania. For, although the military movements are officially attributed to the approaching autumn manœuvres, the fact remains that large sums of gold have quite lately found their way from the Bank of England to the Roumanian capital. The importance of the rôle which King Charles's country is likely to play in the event of a Balkan war can hardly be overestimated when we consider that Roumania is the best governed state, and her army the best organised in the Balkan Peninsula, and that her northern frontier is protected by a line of fortifications pronounced by experts to be formidable.

It remains to consider the attitude of Greece, the state which shares with Bulgaria the expensive privilege of being intimately concerned in Macedonia. If the sufferings of the Macedonian Bulgarians at the hands of the Turkish troops produce a profound impression at Sofia, the sufferings of the Macedonian Greeks at the hands of the Bulgarian insurgent bands produce no less a sensation at Athens. This emotion is all the deeper as the partisans of the Greek cause in Macedonia now find themselves between two fires. The Turks, when their fanaticism is once roused, make no distinction between Christian races. To use their own unsavoury phrase, 'they all are one kind of dirt.' Moreover, the Turkish authorities, in their anxiety to avoid the 'Bulgarian atrocities' outcry, seem to spare, in many cases, the guilty and to punish the innocent, not from any perverse predilection for injustice, but simply because they realise from experience that the Bulgarian has a mighty pro-

tector and avenger in Russia, while it is no one's special interest to protect the Greek. This injustice is facilitated by the Bulgarian insurgents, who, as has been shown, adopt tactics calculated to make their rivals pay the blood price for their own insurrection. The extent of the sufferings of the Greeks in Macedonia is illustrated by the reports of the Greek bishops to the Œcumenical Patriarch, in which they bitterly complain of the murders and outrages committed upon their flocks by the Bulgarian bands; by similar reports addressed by the Greek consuls in Macedonia to the Hellenic government; and by the frequent efforts of the Greek diplomatic agents at Constantinople and the European capitals to draw the attention of the Porte and the Powers to the war of extermination which is waged against the Macedonian Greeks by both Turks and Bulgarians alike.

Yet, of the two, the Bulgarian is the more ancient and more formidable enemy of the Greek. The Greco-Bulgarian feud began more than seven centuries before the advent of the Turk in Europe. The Ottoman conquest interrupted without altogether obliterating it. The memory of old animosities was dulled by four centuries of common slavery, until Russia, in pursuance of her own designs, saw fit to revive it, as Sir A. Henry Layard tells us. At the present moment there are thousands of Greco-Macedonian villagers who, plundered of all they possessed, decimated and homeless, are either starving in the interior of the country or living on Turkish charity at the Lazaretto on the Bosphorus. In view of these facts, and also of the disasters which the Greeks anticipate for their future existence as a nation, should Bulgaria be allowed to expand to the littoral of the Ægean, it is easy to understand the anti-Bulgarian attitude which Greece has maintained throughout the crisis.

The enumeration of the threads that make up the Macedonian tangle suggests of itself the question, 'Is there no way of unravelling it?' There is no lack of 'solutions,' the most noteworthy among which is the plan of reform already described in its origin, its object, and its failure. It is now obvious that something more far-reaching is required; and what this is the Bulgarian agitators themselves have attempted to show us in a

project of settlement submitted to the Sultan and to the European cabinets a few weeks ago. The document is signed by M. E. Lazarovich on behalf of a body which describes itself as 'The Committee for the Autonomy of Macedonia,' without, however, indicating what proportion of the revolutionary party it represents. The omission is to be regretted; for it is a well-known fact that the Bulgarian agitators, though striving with one accord to do away with the Turkish rule, entertain widely divergent views as to the régime that is to take its place. Moreover, the agitation itself, as a whole, represents only the Exarchist population of Macedonia, and therefore, even supposing that 'The Committee for Autonomy' speaks for the entire revolutionary party, it still leaves out of the account the large Greek and Mohammedan elements. However, these failings, while impairing the authority of the document, detract little from its inherent interest.

It consists of twelve articles, in which it is proposed that the actual administrative division of European Turkey into seven vilayets should be superseded by a national division into four provinces, which will be called Albania, Macedonia, Old Servia, and Thrace. Each province will enjoy internal autonomy under the suzerainty of the Sultan, and will be governed by a governor-general of European nationality, named by the Porte, with the consent of the Powers. The whole country will be under the jurisdiction of a high commissioner of European origin, appointed by the six great Powers, and provided with an international police. The delimitation of the four provinces, and their organisation, will be regulated by a European commission, assisted in its labours by a native delegation composed of representatives elected by the population, according to the different nationalities and religions. Its decisions will be sanctioned by an Imperial firman, and their execution will be secured by an international army of occupation of forty-five thousand men, under the command of generals belonging to one of the neutral states of Europe. These arrangements are, of course, to be preceded by the withdrawal of all the Turkish troops, except those required for the garrison of the frontiers.

Such are the principal clauses of a programme which,

be its shortcomings what they may, can hardly be accused of want of thoroughness. The only objection that can reasonably be made to it is its hopeless impracticability. To leave out of the question the most obvious difficulties, such as the mutual jealousies of the great Powers under whose auspices and by whose agents the edifice is to be reared, and the still more lively jealousies of the rival races whose representatives are to assist the 'European commission,' the query still remains: Who will induce the Sultan to withdraw his quarter of a million of troops, and to submit to what in reality amounts to a total renunciation of his rule over the European portion of his empire? Or, if the Sultan can be induced to go so far, why not go a step farther and proceed to a definite partition of the regions in question? It has been said that the bare suggestion of partition would mean war. In our opinion the same would be the meaning of any serious attempt to carry out the Committee's project.

That the present administrative division needs radical modification is a proposition that admits of no dispute. As it stands it is a deliberate violation of all geographical and ethnological law, based on the maxim of *divide et impera*—the last resource of an incompetent ruler. In the vilayet of Kossovo, for example, are included Albanian, Servian, and Bulgarian districts; in the vilayet of Monastir, Albanian, Greek, Wallachian, and Bulgarian; in the vilayet of Salonica, Greek and Bulgarian, and so forth; the net result being racial and religious strife ruinous to the subjects though hardly profitable to the sovereign. The new division proposed in the document which we have just discussed is scarcely an improvement on the old one. Under the comprehensive appellations of 'Albania' and 'Macedonia' there would still continue an internecine struggle between the heterogeneous elements which make up the population of each of the projected provinces. The only lasting solution would be a division into districts composed of a more or less homogeneous population; and this, upon examination, would be found to resolve itself roughly into an eventual partition of the country between Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece, in addition to a new state—Albania. But, we repeat, even this suggestion ignores the interests of powerful outsiders; and besides, to ask the Sultan's consent to it would be tanta-

mount to asking him to commit political suicide—a request to which he can hardly be expected to accede.

On the other hand, if a Turco-Bulgarian war does not intervene, and more radical reforms than those embodied in the Austro-Russian programme are attempted, such reforms, in order to be effective, must touch the very root of the matter. In other words, they must secure the regular payment of public servants and equality of rights between the Mohammedan and non-Mohammedan subjects. The first of these indispensable objects can only be attained by placing the finances of the empire under honest international control; and the second by granting to the Christians a share in the military organisation of the empire. But it is highly doubtful whether the Sultan could quietly acquiesce in either of those measures.

The conclusion forced upon us, after a careful consideration of all the factors involved in the problem, is that nothing short of a miracle can bring about a peaceable solution. A last effort may indeed be made by the Powers in the form of a European conference; and it is not inconceivable that such a conference may succeed in wresting from the Sultan a charter guaranteeing peace and prosperity for his subjects. But, even if this result satisfies the members of the conference, it will not satisfy the agitators, nor will it avert war. The lessons of the past forbid us to entertain any illusions on the subject. Such a conference met at Constantinople in 1876 to consider the general situation; and a charter on the lines anticipated above was then actually obtained, in the form of Midhat Pasha's constitution, which, as the president of the conference said, marked 'a new era of happiness and prosperity for the inhabitants of the Ottoman empire.' What followed is matter of history; and the history of the Near East teaches us that in that part of the world political knots are not untied but cut.



Art.

1. A

see

2. C

Ch

3. L

4. L

le

5. L

Pa

6. L

M

IL i

Fran

hors

viol

susc

de t

répe

l'aff

l'aff

tion

Les

maj

pér

pris

les

moi

que

seil

hôt

app

irri

tan

elle

pou

bat

ce

cro

V

Art. IX.—LA FRANCE ET LES CONGRÉGATIONS.

1. *Associations et Congrégations.* Par M. Waldeck Rousseau. Paris : Charpentier, 1903.
2. *Contrat d'Association.* Par MM. G. Trouillot et Fernand Chapsal. Paris : 1903.
3. *Les Encycliques de Léon XIII.* Paris : 1903.
4. *Le Concordat de 1801 : ses origines : son histoire.* Par le Cardinal Mathieu. Paris : Perrin, 1903.
5. *La liberté d'enseignement.* Par M. Charles Dupuy. Paris : 1903.
6. *La Révolution Française et les Congrégations.* Par M. A. Aulard. Paris : 1903.

IL importe, pour juger sainement la lutte qui agite la France, d'en rechercher les causes et les lois génératrices hors des motifs tout momentanés auxquels elle doit sa violence, mais non sa raison d'être. L'antisémitisme, suscité par Édouard Drumont, avec plus de passion et de talent que de sens historique peut-être, a eu pour réponse, dure et vive comme une riposte d'escrime, l'affaire Dreyfus et ses déplorables conséquences; de l'affaire Dreyfus est sortie la bataille des dernières élections—bataille sans merci, où toute arme semblait loyale. Les républicains, qui sont arrivés avec une imposante majorité à la Chambre de 1902, y apportaient une exaspération motivée, il faut le dire, par le caractère qu'avait pris la campagne électorale; nous voyons aujourd'hui les effets de cette exaspération-là, et si on poursuit les moines avec tant de dûreté, c'est peut-être en partie parce que dans ses livres et dans son journal Drumont a conseillé avec une si brûlante éloquence qu'on pillât les beaux hôtels des banquiers israélites.

La vie n'est qu'action et réaction : une parole de haine appelle irrésistiblement un acte d'injustice. Mais cette irritation des esprits n'est qu'une de ces causes momentanées dont je viens de parler, et encore ne se marque-t-elle que dans les méthodes choisies par le gouvernement pour appliquer la loi de 1901, et dans la bruyante approbation que lui donne une certaine presse.

Les esprits éclairés de ce qui fut le parti nationaliste, et ceux moins éclairés qui s'y rencontrent aussi, feignent de croire, ou croient réellement, que la loi Waldeck Rousseau

soit une création toute nouvelle, due à un nouvel état de choses, et ils s'acharnent à n'y découvrir qu'une affirmation de la manie anti-religieuse, une volonté systématique de supprimer graduellement toute forme de culte, une haine de Dieu, enfin, choquante et un peu sottie. Certes, il y a en France une fraction hostile à la religion, mais il y a autre chose aussi—un sens ardent de patriotisme et le grand instinct de l'indépendance nationale. Lorsqu'il semble attaquer la puissance de Rome dans la personne de ses miliciens, le pays fait acte de défense, et de plus, il suit la tradition que lui a léguée son histoire.

La papauté est moins encore un fait qu'une idée—idée formidable! Il semble que l'étrange destin qui a voulu qu'elle accomplît son développement à ce point prestigieux de l'univers, d'où par voie de conquête les premières formes de la civilisation se sont répandues sur l'Europe, l'ait frappée d'une empreinte immortelle. Ce ne fut pas l'empire allemand—puissance énorme et précaire tout ensemble—qui recueillit l'héritage de la grande Rome républicaine et impériale, ce fut la papauté. A elle, le pouvoir de régner sur les rois, qui était celui de Rome, et le droit hautain d'intervenir dans les conseils des gouvernements; en elle, comme en Rome, est la fière certitude que tous les peuples sont ses sujets; et, quand les princes veulent briser leur vasselage, elle les frappe, comme en usait Rome avec ses tributaires révoltés.

En refoulant le Saint Siègre dans le domaine spirituel, la maison de Savoie a réalisé un fait, elle n'a pas atteint l'idée centrale de la papauté, qui est la conviction de son droit à l'universelle domination. L'un après l'autre, les papes affirment la légitimité de leur immixtion dans toutes les affaires humaines, et que rien ne saurait limiter le pouvoir de l'Église, qui est élevée au-dessus des trônes, C'est, au XI^e siècle, Grégoire VII, ce grand pape qui faisait attendre pieds nus dans la neige un empereur humilié, et qui dit, 'Si le St Siègre a reçu de Dieu le pouvoir de juger les choses spirituelles, pourquoi ne jugerait-il pas aussi les choses temporelles?' Et à la fin du XIX^e siècle, moins brève—les temps ont changé—mais tout aussi résolue, car l'esprit ne change pas, voici la parole de Léon XIII:—

'Prétendre assujettir l'Église au pouvoir civil c'est à la fois une grande injustice et une grande témérité. Par le fait même, on trouble l'ordre, car on donne le pas aux choses

naturelles sur les choses surnaturelles, on tarit ou certainement on diminue beaucoup l'affluence des biens dont l'Église, si elle était sans entraves, comblerait la société.*

L'Église garde à travers l'histoire son caractère ambitieux, elle prétend à représenter l'absolu et l'intangible, elle veut par le gouvernement des consciences agir sur le gouvernement des peuples, car elle est l'héritière de Celui 'qui a reçu les nations en héritage.' Elle reste partout une étrangère impérieuse qui entend tout assimiler et ne daigne se plier à rien. Puissance éternelle qui survit aux puissances que le temps déplace ou détruit, elle a, selon le Cardinal Mathieu, 'une doctrine immuable et un gouvernement dont les principes fondés sur la doctrine sont immuables comme elle.'

La lutte de la France contre l'ingérence ouverte ou occulte du St Siège ne date pas de la troisième République, ni même de la première : elle naît en même temps que la conscience de soi-même prise par la nation, et on la voit se définir nettement à l'heure où, identifiée avec un des plus nobles types humains qui se soient rencontrés, elle est parmi les peuples l'arbitre de la justice et la personnification de la conscience et de la loyauté.

Véritable fondateur de l'Église gallicane, St Louis par sa Pragmatique Sanction de 1268† restituait leur liberté aux élections canoniques, modérait les exactions de Rome et déclarait que : 'la couronne de France ne relève que de Dieu seul.' Ce roi, qu'on peut difficilement taxer d'anticléricalisme, avait donc senti la nécessité d'affirmer l'indépendance de la nation en face des empiètements de l'Église. Il traitait avec le Pape non point seulement comme avec le représentant de Dieu sur la terre, mais surtout comme avec un souverain qui faisait peser sur la France une autorité onéreuse et injustifiée.

Au début du XIV^e siècle la lutte éclate sauvage entre Philippe le Bel et Boniface VIII—ce pape orgueilleux qui se faisait servir à table par des rois, qui tirait tant d'argent de la France, et qui, par la bulle 'Clericis laicos,' interdisait aux ecclésiastiques de contribuer aux charges de l'État,

* Encyclique 'Immortale Dei,' 1 nov. 1885.

† Les Pragmatiques sont de simples édits royaux, réglant d'autorité les matières religieuses, au lieu que les Concordats sont des traités synallagmatiques conclus entre un souverain temporel et le pape.

fût-ce par des dons volontaires, et frappait d'excommunication toute autorité qui ordonnerait ou percevrait un impôt sur les propriétés du clergé, qui représentaient la partie la plus importante des revenus publics. On sait par quelles brutalités Philippe le Bel répondit, et comment le pape, prisonnier pendant trois jours à Anagni, insulté, maltraité, mourut de rage peu de semaines après son retour à Rome. La persécution religieuse dont on s'indigne en ce moment n'a pas encore heureusement pris de si révoltantes formes; les mœurs sont plus décentes; mais le principe qui isole la propriété ecclésiastique est toujours actif; car la pensée catholique reste conforme au travers des siècles.

En 1438, sous Charles VII, la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges intervient de nouveau entre la France et le St Siège. Elle restreint les effets de l'excommunication—cet irrésistible argument des papes—limite les appels en cour de Rome,* supprime les réserves et les annates, contribution levée sur toute la chrétienté, que Louis XI et Henri II, après Charles VII, attaquèrent par des édits, dont Charles V fut impuissant à débarrasser l'Allemagne, et dont la suppression victorieusement faite par Henri VIII commença le schisme qui a dégagé l'Angleterre de la tenace prise de Rome.

L'Église n'accepta pas la Pragmatique de Bourges; et Louis XI l'abolit en 1461, mais pour en rétablir en 1479 les principales dispositions, car c'était là de la défense urgente. Question de liberté morale pour la royauté, question d'argent aussi, et des plus graves, car à aucun moment de la vie des peuples l'intérêt économique n'a cessé d'être celui qui régit tout et à quoi tendent et aboutissent les faits historiques qu'on enseigne aux enfants avec le secours des images—batailles éclatantes, congrès pompeux, ou mariages royaux. Et c'est, entr'autres, au point de vue économique que l'Église de Rome a été,

* L'appel en cour de Rome, qui transportait hors du pays le jugement des causes, fut plus tard contenu par l' 'appel comme d'abus,' qui aboutissait à un recours à l'autorité séculière! Cela commença sous la forme de l' 'Appel du St Siège, au St Siège Apostolique,' c'est à dire, au pape véritablement inspiré du Saint Esprit; ensuite on en appela 'au futur concile'; puis on joignit à l'appel la déclaration de poursuivre au conseil du roi ou dans son parlement, la cassation des actes abusifs. L'appel comme d'abus est la protection efficace sous laquelle s'est développée l'Église gallicane. Il commença d'être en usage au XVI^e siècle.

est encore sous des formes différentes, un dangereux fardeau pour les États.

C'est aussi une affaire d'argent que le Concordat de 1516, conclu entre François I^{er} et Léon X. Le pape y abandonnait au roi la nomination des évêques; le roi rendait au pape les annates, si chers au St Siège, pour qui ils étaient une magnifique source de revenus. L'avocat au parlement Lelièvre de la Grange jugeait ainsi cet arrangement :—

‘C'est un acte violent par lequel deux puissances se sont mutuellement donné ce qui ne leur appartenait pas, le pape cédant au roi le spirituel, et le roi lui accordant le temporel; le pape usurpant les droits de l'Église, et le roi ceux de la nation.’

L'irritation fut grande; l'esprit de France était ouvert déjà à la conscience de ce qu'il y a d'intolérable à payer une redevance à un souverain étranger. Le Parlement ne consentit à enregistrer le Concordat qu'après des ordres réitérés et des lettres de jussion du roi.

En vérité, bien avant que la Révolution ne mêlât un principe de fanatisme anti-religieux à la lutte, la France l'avait commencée, et continuait son effort pour conquérir la liberté dont sa grandissante énergie avait besoin; tout chrétiens qu'ils fussent, les rois ‘très chrétiens’ n'ont pas cessé de protéger le pays contre ce qui dans la religion est si peu religieux. A la fin du XVIII^e siècle les conditions du clergé étaient telles qu'il sentit lui-même la nécessité d'une réforme. En 1789 les évêques offrirent 400 millions pour combler le déficit. Le mouvement était beau, sans doute; mais peut-on admettre qu'une minime fraction de la nation soit en mesure de prélever 400 millions sur des biens qui échappent au contrôle de l'État, fût-ce pour en faire don à l'État?

Vint la Révolution, qui, après avoir commencé en prenant Dieu à témoin de ses bonnes intentions, fit la folie de vouloir supprimer Dieu, et, par ses inutiles violences, ouvrit les voies à une réaction qui dure encore. L'œuvre de l'Assemblée Constituante—en ce qui regarde l'Église—a été définie au point de vue romain, dans un livre qu'il faut citer.

‘Cette œuvre, il n'y a pas deux manières pour un catholique de la juger: c'était un schisme, reposant sur une conception

hérétique des droits de l'État. Poussant à bout les théories régaliennes et parlementaires, la Constituante avait légiféré abusivement dans une matière où l'autorité civile, si elle a le droit de parler, n'a pas le droit de parler seule, et où elle ne peut agir sans s'être concertée avec l'autorité religieuse, dont la compétence précède et domine la sienne. Après avoir supprimé le clergé régulier et la dotation territoriale du clergé séculier, elle avait de son chef bouleversé les circonscriptions diocésaines, changé le mode de nomination aux dignités ecclésiastiques et chassé le Pape de l'Église de France, en prétendant ne pas rompre avec lui, tout cela au nom d'une théologie et d'une histoire fausses que les gallicans eux-mêmes ont reprouvées nettement.' ('Le Concordat de 1801,' p. 41.)

Bonaparte trouva la religion à peu près anéantie ; il était trop latin pour ne pas apercevoir l'inconvénient d'une telle situation, mais aussi trop conscient déjà de son âme césarienne pour admettre une puissance quelconque au-dessus de celle à quoi il se préparait. Il crut rétablir l'équilibre parfait et durable au moyen du Concordat : certains pensent qu'il n'a pas réalisé son dessein,* que le Concordat, au lieu d'être une garantie, devint vite une gêne, et que le Corse, subtil et impérieux, fut vaincu en cette affaire par l'Italien de formes si douces, le bon pape Pie VII qui pleurait lorsque le cardinal Consalvi lui écrivait de mauvaises nouvelles du traité en discussion. Bonaparte avait quelques raisons de se croire irrésistible en face des armées ; il l'était moins en face de la diplomatie romaine.

'Il a dit que la France ne pouvait être sans religion, qu'il en voulait une, et qu'il préférerait la catholique romaine. Il a déclaré qu'il voulait le clergé soumis et fidèle au gouvernement.' (Lettre de Bernier à Consalvi.)

Il souhaitait une religion ; il l'a eue ; reste à savoir si c'était bien celle qu'il voulait. Quant au clergé concordat-

* 'A quoi a servi le Concordat ? A perpétuer une situation anormale, qui n'est la paix que dans la torpeur du sentiment religieux et qui devient la guerre dès que la religion ne sommeille plus et secoue ses liens. A quoi sert-il, sinon à entretenir des fictions dangereuses, à dissimuler le vide des croyances, sous la complication d'une organisation officielle ou de préparer des conflits toujours dangereux entre deux grandes puissances qui ne peuvent s'entendre que dans la liberté.' (Pressensé, 'Revue Nationale, janvier 1868.)

taire, il a été soumis de fait sous une main si lourde, mais il préparait l'avenir, et ceux qui ont hérité de sa pensée intime n'ont jamais été ni soumis ni fidèles de cœur aux gouvernements issus de cette Révolution, dont pendant un moment Bonaparte fut le représentant.

Le Concordat de 1801, qui avait reconnu pour légitime la propriété des acquéreurs de biens ecclésiastiques (Art. 13), ne fait, soit dit en passant, aucune allusion aux communautés religieuses ; les couvents ont été ouverts, les moines chassés ; il n'y en a plus nulle part sur le sol de France. Rome, qui se préoccupe du sort des prêtres séculiers et des évêques, ne semble pas s'être souvenue de la célèbre milice qui partout lui frayait la route. Chaque article du Concordat a été discuté longuement. Consalvi travaillait vingt heures de suite pour changer deux mots dans un paragraphe. On a eu le temps de penser à tout, et pourtant on n'a pas pensé aux moines ! Étrange oubli, mais qui s'explique par la certitude qu'avait le St Siège de les voir bientôt revenir, discrètement d'abord, puis autrement, sans qu'il fut besoin de les y encourager par des traités. Ils sont revenus ; et le XIX^e siècle est agité par leur incessant effort pour reconquérir la société qui avait échappé à eux et à Rome dont ils sont les agents.

La Révolution a renversé le principe d'autorité, supprimé les fonctions héréditaires, et substitué la loi du nombre au gouvernement des oligarchies. En atteignant tant de privilèges, elle a frappé trop d'ambitions qui sous le régime ancien trouvaient aisément leur satisfaction, pour n'avoir pas créé de terribles rancunes. L'esprit de revanche qu'elle a suscité n'est pas encore apaisé. Les moines ont utilisé les tendances de certains à s'acharner sur un espoir de régression vers le passé. Ils ont compris qu'il leur fallait reprendre les esprits par le moyen de l'éducation, ressaisir le gouvernement des consciences de la génération nouvelle, et que pour parvenir il leur convenait d'avoir des alliés fidèles dans les grands corps de l'État. Ce dont il s'agissait dès la première heure—ce dont il s'agit toujours—c'était bien moins de réinstaller une monarchie absolue, constitutionnelle ou libérale, que de vaincre l'esprit de la Révolution.

Napoléon sentit très vite l'insuffisance du Concordat à défendre le pays contre l'envahissement inlassable de Rome ; les 'articles organiques' vinrent renforcer le traité

en rendre les clauses plus étroites.* Comme elle n'avait pas accepté la Pragmatique Sanction de Charles VII, l'Église n'accepta pas les articles organiques. Qu'on me permette de donner à leur sujet deux manières de voir qui expriment avec une netteté parfaite l'abîme infranchissable qui sépare l'esprit religieux de l'esprit civil :—

'La loi organique était pour le gouvernement français un acte tout intérieur qui le regardait seul, et qui, à ce titre, ne devait pas être soumis au St Siège.' (Thiers, 'Hist. du Consulat,' livre xiv.)

'Tout cela n'existe pas aux yeux de l'Église, parce que cela a été fait sans elle et contre elle, et on ne trouverait pas en France, à l'heure qu'il est, un évêque, un prêtre, un catholique instruit, qui attribue la moindre valeur canonique aux Articles organiques.' (Mathieu, 'Le Concordat de 1801,' p. 328.)

Ils existent pourtant, et après eux de nombreuses lois qui ont tenté de mettre un empêchement au développement des Congrégations. J'en citerai quelques-unes, plus loin. Maintenant, je vais tenter d'exprimer ce que sont les hommes qu'atteint la loi du 1^{er} juillet 1901, et quelle est leur action dans le pays.

La richesse des couvents est née de la pieuse épouvante des châtimens éternels. Ils ont été fondés ou dotés dans les temps anciens—et sans doute en va-t-il encore de même—par des personnes que les circonstances avaient conduites à mal faire, en dépit de l'excellence de leurs intentions, et qui redoutaient les peines d'après la vie.

'Tous les catholiques, en effet, reconnaissent qu'ils appartiennent à une immense famille dont Jésus-Christ est le chef et dont les biens spirituels peuvent se communiquer d'un membre à l'autre. Ils croient à la vertu des intercessions mutuelles, des expiations de l'innocent pour le coupable, et pensent que la prière du juste peut aller jusqu'au delà de la tombe, soulager et délivrer les âmes qui n'ont pas été trouvées assez pures pour entrer immédiatement en possession de la récompense éternelle. Les rois, les grands seigneurs, les grandes dames, et les bourgeois d'autrefois qui ont fondé des couvents étaient donc convaincus qu'ils faisaient une œuvre méritoire, utile à eux-

* La suppression des congrégations, faite par la loi du 18 août 1792, fut maintenue et confirmée par la loi du 18 germinal, an X (Art. 2).

mêmes et à toute la société chrétienne, en élevant à Dieu des sanctuaires où sa louange retentirait nuit et jour, en assurant aux moines par des donations le loisir de la psalmodie sainte et des exercices spirituels, et en obtenant ainsi leur intercession pour cette vie et pour l'autre. . . . Les ordres actifs et les congrégations récentes ont profité comme les contemplatifs de cette croyance au dogme de la communion des saints, qui leur assure la persistante générosité des fideles. C'est là un instinct profond de l'Âme chrétienne qui inspirera toujours des donations pieuses et tendra à reformer le "milliard" longtemps après que le temps aura flétri les lauriers de ceux qui l'ont attaqué. . . . La propriété des moines était perpétuelle, puisqu'elle répondait à des besoins permanents. L'Église, en effet, communique quelque chose de son immutabilité à tout ce qu'elle touche.' ('Le Concordat de 1801,' pp. 87-89.)

Je n'aurais jamais si bien exprimé ni de façon plus concluante pourquoi les États sont menacés par la propriété ecclésiastique, qui renaît et s'accroît toujours malgré les lois, et qui a ce caractère d'immobilité dont les finances d'un pays ne se trouvent pas au mieux.

S'il est excessif de dire, 'qu'aujourd'hui, comme il y a mille ans, la civilisation ne vit que par l'Église,'* il faut pourtant reconnaître que les couvents ont rendu d'immenses services. C'est là un fait que nul ne songe à nier. Ils ont été de magnifiques centres d'études et d'activité intellectuelle, et les abus même de la scolastique ont contribué à aiguïser les esprits: c'est peut-être grâce aux perfectionnements dont toute la masse des cerveaux humains est redevable à ses subtiles gymnastiques et à ses savantes et délicates contraintes que se sont formées les intelligences alertes ou profondes, rompues à toute lutte, d'Ulrich de Hütten, de Montaigne, d'Érasme, et de Voltaire.

Les moines du moyen-âge ont aidé la pensée à durer pendant ces rudes temps barbares, certes; ils nous ont conservé quelques-uns des chefs d'œuvre du génie ancien, évidemment, encore qu'ils en aient détruit ou compromis beaucoup d'autres; on montre—non sans orgueil—dans les bibliothèques des couvents illustres des parchemins devenus d'un bleu précieux, à la morsure des acides qui ont travaillé pour faire ressortir des textes antiques, disparus sous les comptes de cuisine du monastère dont un bon

* Keller, 'Les Congrégations religieuses en France' (Paris, 1900), p. 9,

moine attentif et ordonné les avait couverts, après les avoir grattés plus qu'il n'aurait dû. Mais laissons cela et de même toutes les critiques qu'on a pu faire des moines; admettons sans réticence la perfection de leur vie, la pureté exquise de leurs mœurs, acceptons cette formule qu'une parole sacrée a donnée d'eux et de leurs ordres :—

‘Âmes fortes et généreuses qui par la prière et la contemplation, par de saintes austérités, par la pratique de certaines règles, s'efforcent de monter jusqu'aux plus hauts sommets de la vie spirituelle. Nés sous l'action de l'Église, dont l'autorité sanctionne leur gouvernement et leur discipline, les ordres religieux forment une portion choisie du troupeau de Jésus Christ.’ (Léon XIII, Lettre au card. Richard, 23 déc. 1900.)

C'est justement sous cet aspect de milice de l'Église qu'il convient de les examiner; car il est bien vrai que, depuis le temps où Grégoire VII se servait d'eux pour arracher des autels et livrer aux exécutions sommaires de la populace les prêtres que son autorité morale était insuffisante à contraindre au célibat, jusqu'au temps où les disciples de St Dominique se montrèrent si farouches inquisiteurs, et à celui où les Jésuites donnèrent des preuves d'un si prodigieux génie diplomatique, les moines ont toujours été les fils chéris de Rome, et en ont représenté la pensée secrète.

On s'étonne de voir aux époques où la foi catholique fleurit avec le plus de force, la société civile être hostile aux moines. On a un texte de Charlemagne qui dit—

‘Est-ce donc avoir renoncé au monde que d'augmenter chaque jour ses biens par tous les moyens licites ou illicites, en promettant le Paradis ou en menaçant de l'enfer?’

Presque toute la littérature bouffonne du moyen-âge et de la Renaissance s'est exercée contre eux. Ils causent une irritation un peu haineuse qui va se perpétuant au travers des changements que les siècles en passant apportent dans les esprits. Cette persévérante antipathie ne s'expliquerait-elle pas par la répugnance qu'inspire l'être qui s'est mis à l'abri des charges de toute nature qu'entraîne l'acceptation intégrale de la vie? Il y a un abîme entre les conditions d'existence du prêtre séculier et celles du moine. C'est une rude mission de dévouement et de charité que la mission du prêtre, et qui n'a

guère de compensation que dans l'héroïque et modeste joie du devoir accompli en vue de réaliser un idéal. Le prêtre séculier reste dans la vie civile ; il est propriétaire, donc responsable ; il a contact permanent avec toutes les formes et les difficultés de l'existence. Il y a dans les campagnes des milliers de curés que leur traitement nourrit à peine, qui, desservant plusieurs paroisses, doivent faire à pied dans la neige des kilomètres pour dire leur seconde messe. Traités en inférieurs dans les châteaux, mal vus souvent d'une population hostile, sans autre appui que leur foi, ils mènent de pauvres vies. Dans les villes leur condition n'est pas non plus fort attrayante : le confessionnal de la paroisse n'est guère fréquenté que par les cuisinières, ce n'est pas vers eux que vont les consciences délicates des femmes élégantes et des hommes du monde, c'est vers les chapelles des Dominicains ou des Jésuites ; ce n'est pas pour eux non plus les triomphes oratoires des Carêmes et des Mois de Marie, mais pour les moines encore, qui font dans les églises des saisons de sermons, comme les grands acteurs vont en 'tournée' à l'étranger ou en province. Aussi la dure situation qui est faite au clergé séculier par l'envahissement des 'réguliers' détourne-t-elle d'une si médiocre existence les hommes que la vie religieuse attire, mais qui, se sentant une valeur intellectuelle, désirent faire une carrière et avoir des succès. Le niveau de la mentalité et de la culture du clergé séculier a, pour ces raisons, baissé d'une façon fort dommageable à la religion. Lors des récentes expulsions on a pu en avoir de nombreuses preuves dont je ne citerai que celle-ci. L'évêque de Versailles, devant remplacer dans son séminaire deux professeurs Picpuiciens dont l'ordre avait été dissous, ne put dans tout le diocèse trouver deux prêtres assez instruits pour occuper les chaires d'enseignement laissées vides.

Au couvent on est protégé contre les difficultés matérielles, sûr du lendemain, débarrassé de toute responsabilité, libre de suivre l'étude, l'intrigue, ou l'élan mystique qui vous requiert. 'Les moines (a-t-on dit) ce sont de vieux garçons qui se réunissent pour vivre de leurs rentes.' La formule est plaisante mais non tout à fait juste : les vieux garçons demeurent en état de contact effectif avec la masse humaine, et il en est autrement pour les moines.

En effet, les congrégations s'établissent sous l'obligation du triple vœu de pauvreté, de chasteté, et d'obéissance. Le premier de ces vœux détache le moine de ces intérêts matériels qui consistent à être propriétaire et à contribuer ainsi à la prospérité du pays ; le second, c'est la renonciation à la famille, qu'il faut faire vivre et pour laquelle il faut vivre ; par le troisième vœu, le moine fait don de soi-même à Dieu, c'est à dire qu'il abdique sa volonté et son jugement, échappe à la responsabilité qui est toute la dignité de l'homme, et se dispense de la solidarité, qui en est toute la beauté morale. Ne pouvant ni posséder, ni se survivre dans des enfants, ni raisonner, puisqu'il s'est soumis une fois pour toutes et sans contrôle, il semble que le moine ait aliéné tout ce qui constitue la personnalité humaine, et qu'il ait fait de lui-même une créature à l'écart de l'humanité. C'est de cela que lui en veulent depuis des siècles ceux qui sont restés dans le combat de la vie, et en acceptent, avec les joies, les douleurs nécessaires.

On comprend qu'en se plaçant au point de vue de l'intérêt de l'État une pareille conception de l'existence paraisse mauvaise, et qu'on puisse juger que, même les actes de dévouement de quelques-uns, ou de la plupart, ne suffisent pas à compenser les inconvénients qu'implique le retranchement d'un si grand nombre de citoyens. Car c'est un retranchement positif. Enrégimenté de la sorte, le moine devient la propriété de la congrégation, s'absorbe en elle, qui, au lieu de réaliser un accroissement de forces individuelles, ainsi qu'il arrive dans les associations où chacun conserve son individualité, produit une diminution progressive dont il est impossible qu'un État ne se préoccupe pas, et dont il a le devoir d'interdire le développement indéfini.

De là tant de dispositions prises dans un but de contrôle et qui ont imposé aux établissements religieux l'obligation de se faire autoriser—obligation à laquelle une si grande quantité d'ordres a échappé que l'urgence s'est affirmée d'une loi nouvelle, comportant des pénalités pour qui l'enfreindrait.

En A.D. 370, 372, et 390 on trouve déjà des lois qui, dans le but de restreindre l'accroissement de leurs richesses, frappent de nullité les legs faits aux couvents. Les ordonnances de St Louis tiennent en trois principes :

nécessité de l'autorisation, nécessité de la surveillance, et droit d'amortissement. Ce droit était tantôt de six fois le produit des biens religieux, tantôt d'un tiers de leur valeur, tantôt égal à leur valeur. C'est à dire que l'État se reconnaissait le droit de reprendre les biens de mainmorte dès qu'il jugeait qu'ils pouvaient devenir dangereux pour son intérêt ou pour sa sécurité. Puis c'est en 1749 l'édit de d'Aguesseau, tellement pareil par l'intention et même par certaines formes à la loi de 1901 que je demande l'autorisation de le citer, le rapprochement des deux textes étant de nature à démontrer que le 'péril congréganiste' n'est pas purement une invention et un moyen de la politique parlementaire.

'Le désir que nous avons de maintenir de plus en plus le bon ordre dans l'intérieur du royaume, nous fait regarder comme un des principaux objets de notre attention les inconvénients de la multiplication des établissements des gens de mainmorte, et la facilité qu'ils trouvent à acquérir des fonds naturellement destinés à la subsistance et à la conservation des familles, en sorte qu'une très grande partie des fonds de notre royaume se trouve actuellement possédée par ceux dont les biens, ne pouvant être diminués par des aliénations, s'augmentent au contraire par de nouvelles acquisitions.

'Renouvelant autant que de besoin les défenses portées par les rois nos prédécesseurs, voulons qu'il ne puisse être fait aucun nouvel établissement de chapitres, collèges, séminaires, maisons ou communautés religieuses, même sous prétexte d'hospices, congrégations, confréries, hôpitaux ou autres corps de quelque qualité qu'ils soient, ni, pareillement, aucune nouvelle érection de chapelle ou autre titre de bénéfice, dans toute l'étendue de notre royaume, si ce n'est en vertu de notre permission expresse, portée par nos lettres patentes, enregistrée en nos parlements ou conseils supérieurs, chacun dans son ressort.* Défendons de faire à l'avenir aucune disposition, par acte de dernière volonté, pour fonder un établissement de la qualité de ceux ci-dessus mentionnés ou au profit de personnes qui seraient chargées de former le dit établissement. Déclarons nuls ceux qui seraient faits à l'avenir sans avoir obtenu nos lettres patentes dans les formes ci-dessus prescrites.† Voulons que les actes qui pourraient avoir été faits en faveur des établissements précités par lesquels ils auraient reçu des biens, de quelque nature que ce soit, à titre

* Voir la loi du 1^{er} juillet 1901, Titre III, Art. 13 et 16. † Id. Art. 16.

gratuit ou onéreux, soient déclarés nuls, et que, tous ceux qui auraient été chargés de former ou d'administrer les dits établissements, soient déchus de tous les droits résultant des actes ou dispositions, même de la répétition des sommes qu'ils auraient payées pour les dites acquisitions ou employées à la constitution de rentes. Les enfants ou présomptifs héritiers seront admis, même du vivant de ceux qui auront fait les dits actes ou dispositions, à réclamer les biens par eux donnés ou aliénés. Voulons qu'ils en soient envoyés en possession pour en jouir en toute propriété, avec restitution des fruits ou arrérages, à compter du jour de la demande qu'ils en auront formulée. Il sera ordonné par notre procureur général, que, faute par les personnes dénommées de former leur demande dans le délai qui sera fixé à cet effet, les dits biens seront vendus au plus offrant et dernier enchérisseur, et que le prix en sera confisqué à notre profit, pour être par nous appliqué à des hôpitaux, ou employé au soulagement des pauvres, ou à tels ouvrages publics que nous jugerons à propos.*

Sous la Restauration, à un moment où la réaction cléricale était en plein triomphe, on tenta de faire une loi qui modifiât dans un sens favorable aux congrégations les dispositions prises par la Monarchie et développées par la République. La force des faits fut telle, que le contraire de ce qu'on attendait se produisit, et que du débat sortit la loi de 1825 qui proclame qu'aucun établissement religieux, même de femmes, ne pourra être fondé sans une loi qui l'autorise, et qu'aucun nouvel établissement ne pourra être fondé par ceux qui existent déjà sans l'autorisation du roi, sans un décret. La monarchie de Juillet maintint cette législation. Sous le second Empire on substitua la nécessité d'un décret à celle d'une loi, mais le principe resta intact.

Dans le courant du XIX^e siècle, bien des paroles se sont élevées pour conseiller la résistance à l'empiètement des moines, pour affirmer qu'il fallait exercer sur eux une surveillance, contre eux une défense, et les contraindre au respect de la loi. C'est Portalis qui dit :

'Ce qui ne devrait pas être possible, c'est qu'un établissement, même utile, existe, lorsqu'il ne peut avoir aucune existence de droit, et que, loin d'être protégé par la puissance des lois, il le soit par leur impuissance.'

* Voir la loi du 1^{er} juillet 1901, Titre III, Art. 18, parag. 10-13.

Et Pasquier, à la tribune de la chambre des pairs :

‘C’est un principe éternel et indépendant des lois positives, que celui qui ne permet pas qu’une société quelconque se forme dans un État, sans l’approbation des grands corps de la nation.’

Et Lainé en 1825 :

‘Les congrégations changent l’état des personnes, celles-ci n’appartiennent plus à leurs familles : affranchies de la puissance paternelle, elles font partie d’une corporation permanente.’

Et Odilon Barrot :

‘Je ne serai pas plus libéral que la Constituante ; je n’admettrai pas que mon pays puisse être couvert de congrégations et de couvents, en face de la loi qui resterait silencieuse et impuissante.’

Et Dupin (1845) :

‘Ne confondons pas la question des congrégations avec celle des associations. Les associations se forment entre simples citoyens, des pères de famille, vivant dans leurs maisons, exerçant leur commerce ou leur profession, vivant dans le monde, se réunissant pour un motif déterminé, politique, littéraire, ou autre : en cela l’état de leurs personnes n’est pas affecté. Au sortir de la réunion, ils sont ce qu’ils étaient avant d’y arriver, citoyens au même titre, se mêlant aux devoirs de la cité. Dans les congrégations il n’en est pas ainsi : on se lie par des vœux, on se lie par des serments, on dénature sa personne, on abdique son individualité. À la place de tel homme, c’est un couvent, soumis à un abbé, à un chef spirituel ; toutes les volontés individuelles s’effacent et disparaissent devant l’être collectif moral, qui représente tous les membres et constitue une société dans l’État, une société qui vit par une organisation qui lui est propre.’

Et Victor Hugo :

‘Vous êtes les parasites de l’Église, la maladie de l’Église ! Cessez donc de mêler l’Église à vos affaires, à vos stratagèmes, à vos combinaisons, à vos doctrines, à vos ambitions. Ne l’appellez pas votre mère, pour en faire votre servante !’

Et Lamartine (séance du 3 mai 1844) :

‘Si la société reconnaissait aux ordres mendiants le droit d’infecter et de ronger le pays, elle donnerait une prime, un véritable privilège, à une mendicité systématique et sacrée

contre la véritable indigence, contre la véritable misère. . . Je vais plus loin. Si les séductions pieuses entraînaient par masses innombrables, dans les cloîtres, des individus des deux sexes, et les faisaient émigrer de la vie sociale dans la vie monacale, l'État, sans porter atteinte à la liberté individuelle, devrait, sous le rapport des mœurs, de la famille, de la propriété, de la société travaillante, se prémunir contre de pareils abus de religion. . . Enfin je dis que, s'il arrivait que des associations religieuses s'introduisissent, à l'abri de cette liberté, pour le saper, pour travailler contre les lois du pays, l'État aurait certes le droit de les saisir, de les interrompre, et même de les proscrire, dans l'accomplissement de cette conspiration sacrée. . . Dans ma pensée, je crois la propriété de toute espèce de congrégation funeste, dangereuse, ruineuse pour la nation et la famille. L'État ne devrait les admettre que comme associations non protégées, non possédantes, et viagères.'

Tous ces hommes que j'ai choisis parmi ceux dont le recul historique permet déjà qu'on juge de sang-froid les intentions, ne rêvaient pas de détruire la religion, mais aucun d'eux ne pouvait être indifférent au fait dangereux de l'immobilisation immense des capitaux détenus par les congrégations, et dont la somme s'est depuis élevée dans des proportions dont on va pouvoir juger le sens et la portée. Ils s'inquiétaient aussi de la menace que représente l'esprit catholique romain, pour une nation qui pense que la liberté est le bel aboutissement nécessaire de l'effort humain.

Les congrégations sont un danger économique pour le pays, un danger politique aussi. Examinons d'abord le premier point.

Le nombre des moines, qui en 1789 était d'environ 60,000, est aujourd'hui de 190,000. Au mépris de la loi les établissements non-autorisés ont toujours été croissant. De 1877 à 1900 le chiffre des religieuses non-autorisées passait de 14,000 à 75,000, celui des religieuses autorisées tombait de 113,750 à 54,409.

Dans un compte-rendu décennal du Conseil d'État on trouve le tableau suivant des acquisitions des congrégations :

	Fr.
De 1802 à 1814 (douze ans)	105,409
De 1815 à 1830 (quinze ans)	5,442,953
De 1830 à 1845 (quinze ans)	5,972,831
De 1852 à 1860 (huit ans)	25,102,178

Les dons faits aux congrégations s'élèvent :

De 1830 à 1845, à	304,000
De 1852 à 1860, à	9,119,435

La mainmorte était évaluée au milieu du XIX^e siècle à 50 millions ; en 1880 les immeubles possédés ou occupés par des congrégations représentaient 700 millions ; actuellement on en est à un milliard. Quel peut être, si on part de ces sommes, celles de la mainmorte mobilière ? De tels chiffres se passent de commentaires. Fussent-ils moindres d'ailleurs, que le principe resterait le même. M. Waldeck Rousseau l'a dit justement, 'L'ordre public exige qu'aucune convention particulière ne porte atteinte à la libre circulation des biens.'

L'objection c'est que ces richesses accumulées servent le pays par l'usage qui en est fait : charité, missions, instruction. Pour la charité, on ne voit pas que ce soient les congrégations qui prétendent échapper au contrôle qui donnent les plus grands résultats ; car les congrégations autorisées, avec 54,000 membres seulement, justifient de 57,000 assistés, tandis que les non-autorisées, avec 75,000 membres, ne justifient que de 25,000 personnes secourues. Quant aux missions, la plupart sont entre les mains d'ordres autorisés et en règle avec l'État ; et à ce sujet, qui prête si généreusement aux amplifications lyriques sur l'âme de la France portée au loin par le dévouement des moines, on doit faire cette restriction que, subventionnées par l'État dans le but de développer l'influence française, ces missions, abondamment recrutées hors de France, contiennent une grande quantité de moines espagnols, italiens, et même allemands, qui apprennent l'allemand, l'espagnol, et l'italien, en même temps sans doute que la vénération de l'Espagne et de l'Italie et de l'Allemagne, aux enfants qui leur sont confiés.

Quant à l'instruction, c'est un point vif de la question. Rend-on service à l'État en armant les enfants contre ses institutions et en les préparant à les attaquer ? Les congrégations pensent que oui ; le gouvernement trouve que non. Est-ce un inconvénient dans ce pays, dont l'esprit de parti est la maladie, de cultiver soigneusement, comme en des pépinières, des partisans hostiles à son gouvernement ? L'État a-t-il le droit de demander à ceux qui aspirent à occuper ses fonctions d'avoir appris à le servir

plutôt qu'à le combattre? Et enfin l'Église est-elle en état, non point de persécution subie mais d'hostilité ouverte*; et, pour employer la formule des enfants qui se disputent, n'est-ce pas 'elle qui a commencé'? Le programme des Jésuites est venu un jour à la connaissance publique; il révèle avec netteté leurs intentions: le voici.

'Un seul culte reconnu, le culte catholique, sa pratique obligatoire. Les noms des non-pratiquants affichés à la porte des paroisses. La restitution des biens ecclésiastiques. Le mariage civil déclaré un concubinat. Les registres de l'état civil rendus au clergé.'

Ce texte, cité par M. Waldeck Rousseau à la tribune de la Chambre, est ancien déjà. La forme des désirs de l'ordre est peut-être quelque peu modifiée, mais on peut tenir pour certain que le fond en demeure identique, et que c'est vers la reprise complète de la société par le pouvoir religieux que tend son enseignement. La République est-elle justifiée à vouloir se défendre? On lui oppose ses promesses de liberté, mais d'abord saurait-il y avoir une liberté qui constitue une menace pour l'État? et enfin est-il concevable qu'un gouvernement se laisse détruire au nom de la liberté? Vouloir cela ne serait-ce pas analogue, sous le prétexte qu'un homme est brave, à l'envoyer au combat les mains attachées?

Si la République est hostile à l'enseignement congréganiste, Rome n'est pas favorable à l'enseignement universitaire (*state education*). Léon XIII s'est exprimé formellement à ce sujet, voici en quels termes:

'Il faut absolument que les pères et les mères dignes de ce nom veillent à ce que leurs enfants, parvenus à l'âge d'apprendre, reçoivent l'enseignement religieux, et ne rencontrent dans l'école rien qui blesse la foi ou la pureté des mœurs. Cette sollicitude pour l'éducation de leurs enfants,

* Une armée que l'ennemi ne cesse de harceler doit avoir toute la liberté de ses mouvements, et il faut que le chef qui la connaît puisse assigner à chacun son poste de combat. C'est le sens légitime d'une parole fâcheuse qui a été souvent reprochée à un archevêque: 'Mon clergé est un régiment, il faut qu'il marche.' (Cardinal Mathieu, 'Le Concordat,' p. 333.) Cette phraséologie toute militaire a un caractère révélateur; elle est sans doute fort différente de celle en usage au temps de la persécution de l'an 64.

c'est la loi divine de concert avec la loi naturelle qui l'impose, et rien ne saurait les en dispenser.*

'Les parents doivent pénétrer l'éducation des principes de la morale chrétienne et s'opposer absolument à ce que leurs enfants fréquentent les écoles où ils sont exposés à boire le funeste poison de l'impiété.†

'L'Église, gardienne et vengeresse de l'intégrité de la foi, et qui, en vertu de la mission qu'elle a reçue de Dieu son auteur, doit appeler à la vérité chrétienne toutes les nations, et surveiller avec soin les enseignements donnés à la jeunesse placée sous son autorité, l'Église a toujours condamné ouvertement les écoles mixtes ou neutres, et a maintes fois averti les pères de famille, afin que, sur ce point si important, ils demeurassent toujours sur leurs gardes.‡

'Vous savez ce que sont devenues les écoles publiques; aucune place n'y est plus laissée à l'autorité de l'Église; et à ce moment où il serait si nécessaire de travailler avec amour à façonner ces âmes encore tendres aux devoirs de la vie chrétienne, c'est alors qu'on impose silence à la voix de la religion. Ceux qui sont plus avancés en âge courent un péril encore plus grand, celui du vice même de l'enseignement, qui, au lieu d'initier la jeunesse à la connaissance du vrai, ne produit en elle que l'infatuation des doctrines les plus fallacieuses.§

On sait quelle fut toujours la modération de Léon XIII: sa volonté apparaît assez claire pour qu'on ne doive pas y insister. L'état de guerre est indiqué, avec réserve mais avec évidence aussi. On le trouve révélé de façon plus énergique dans ces paroles du comte de Mun adressées à une réunion de la Jeunesse Catholique :

'C'est une œuvre de lutte que vous commencez ici. Au dehors, ici peut-être, à Paris, dans les grandes villes, il y a d'autres jeunes gens comme vous, ardents et audacieux. Il y a une autre jeunesse, fille de l'éducation rationaliste. . . . C'est le combat qui s'engage, la lutte solennelle qui vous est préparée quand vous allez franchir ce seuil. . . . Et pourquoi donc auriez-vous peur? Est-ce que l'histoire de ce siècle n'est pas une continuelle revanche de l'Église sur la Révolution?'

Voilà une situation bien précisée: on élève dans les

* Encyclique 'Nobilissima Gallorum Gens'; 8 février 1884.

† Encyclique 'Sapientiae Christianae'; 10 janvier 1890.

‡ Ib.

§ Encyclique 'Exeunte jam anno'; 25 décembre 1888.

écoles catholiques une jeunesse qui doit dès son entrée dans la vie commencer 'la lutte solennelle' contre l'autre jeunesse nourrie de la pensée moderne dans les écoles de l'État. Et de quoi s'agit-il en somme? D'assurer la victoire du catholicisme. Et sur qui? Sur les institutions du pays.

Ou bien il faut accueillir son ennemi dans sa maison, le nourrir et lui donner des armes, ou bien le vaincre, ou tout au moins le tenir en respect. C'est ce qu'a tenté de faire la loi Waldeck Rousseau.*

* Voici les articles principaux de la 'Loi du 1er juillet 1901,' ayant rapport aux congrégations religieuses :—

Titre III, Art. 13.—Aucune congrégation religieuse ne peut se former sans une autorisation donnée par une loi qui déterminera les conditions de son fonctionnement. Elle ne pourra fonder aucun établissement qu'en vertu d'un décret rendu en Conseil d'État. La dissolution de la congrégation ou la fermeture de tout établissement pourront être prononcées par décret rendu en conseil des ministres.

Art. 14.—Nul n'est admis à diriger, soit directement, soit par personne interposée, un établissement d'enseignement, de quelque ordre qu'il soit, ni à y donner l'enseignement, s'il appartient à une congrégation religieuse non autorisée. . . .

Art. 15.—Toute congrégation religieuse tient un état de ses recettes et dépenses ; elle dresse chaque année le compte financier de l'année écoulée et l'état inventorié de ses biens meubles et immeubles. La liste complète de ses membres, mentionnant leur nom patronymique, ainsi que le nom sous lequel ils sont désignés dans la congrégation, leur nationalité, âge, et lieu de naissance, la date de leur entrée, doit se trouver au siège de la congrégation. Celle-ci est tenue de représenter sans déplacement sur toute réquisition du préfet, à lui-même ou à son délégué, les comptes, états et listes ci-dessus indiqués. . . .

Art. 16.—Toute congrégation formée sans autorisation sera déclarée illicite. . . .

Art. 18.—Les congrégations existantes au moment de la promulgation de la présente loi, qui n'auraient pas été antérieurement autorisées ou reconnues, devront, dans le délai de trois mois, justifier qu'elles ont fait les diligences nécessaires pour se conformer à ses prescriptions. À défaut de cette justification, elles seront réputées dissoutes de plein droit. Il en sera de même des congrégations auxquelles l'autorisation aura été refusée.

La liquidation des biens détenus par elles aura lieu en justice. Le tribunal, à la requête du ministère public, nommera, pour y procéder, un liquidateur qui aura pendant toute la durée de la liquidation tous les pouvoirs d'un administrateur sequestre. Le jugement ordonnant la liquidation sera rendu public dans la forme prescrite pour les annonces légales.

Les biens et valeurs appartenant aux membres de la congrégation antérieurement à leur entrée dans la congrégation, ou qui leur seraient échus depuis, soit par la succession ab intestat en ligne directe ou collatérale, soit par donation ou legs en ligne directe, leur seront restitués. Les dons et legs qui leur auraient été faits autrement qu'en ligne directe pourront être également revendiqués, mais à la charge par les bénéficiaires de faire

Ainsi qu'on peut voir, elle contraint les congrégations à se faire autoriser par la Chambre, et dissout celles qui ne veulent pas se conformer à cette obligation. On procède à la liquidation des biens des congrégations dissoutes; les valeurs qui appartenaient aux congréganistes avant leur entrée au couvent leur sont rendues; les dons ou legs faits à la communauté sont restitués à ceux qui les avaient faits, sous condition de les employer à des œuvres d'assistance lorsque le but de ces libéralités aura été spécialement une œuvre d'assistance. La liquidation pourvoit à l'entretien des pauvres hospitalisés par les congrégations; et des rentes viagères sont faites aux membres des congrégations qui n'auront pas de moyens d'existence assurés. Mais il est interdit à tout individu appartenant à une congrégation non-autorisée d'enseigner ou de diriger un établissement d'éducation. Les contrevenants à la loi sont punis d'amendes et d'emprisonnement (Art. 8).

Jusqu'à présent, si la loi exigeait l'autorisation, le mépris de la loi n'était susceptible que de sanctions administratives; actuellement il est passible de pénalités, mais qui ne peuvent être appliquées aux membres d'une congrégation qu'après un jugement qui l'a déclarée dissoute. C'est seulement si, malgré ce jugement, elle se perpétue ou se reforme qu'elle tombe sous l'application d'un texte. La nouveauté de la loi réside donc en ceci, qu'elle affirme la volonté et donne le moyen de faire désormais respecter les droits de l'État.

J'espère avoir prouvé par tant d'exemples, dont j'ai peut-être fatigué la patience du lecteur, que de telles mesures étaient nécessaires à prendre. Tout le monde le sentait, même ceux que l'esprit de parti a poussés à vociférer le plus énergiquement contre elles. Tout le monde: même le pape, dont la voix s'est élevée bien

la preuve qu'ils n'ont pas été les personnes interposées prévues par l'article 17. Les biens et valeurs acquis à titre gratuit, et qui n'auraient pas été spécialement affectés par l'acte de libéralité à une œuvre d'assistance, pourront être revendiqués par le donateur, ses héritiers ou ayants droit, ou par les héritiers ou ayants droit du testateur, sans qu'il puisse leur être opposé aucune prescription pour le temps écoulé avant le jugement prononçant la liquidation. Si les biens ou valeurs ont été donnés ou légués en vue de gratifier non les congréganistes, mais de pourvoir à une œuvre d'assistance, ils ne pourront être revendiqués qu'à charge de pourvoir à l'accomplissement du but assigné à la libéralité. . . .

faiblement pour défendre les congrégations menacées. Dans sa lettre au cardinal archevêque de Paris (23 décembre 1901), Léon XIII se bornait à dire beaucoup de bien des moines, à vanter leur sainteté, à rappeler leur services. Il grondait—doucement—le mauvais esprit moderne, marquait de n'avoir pas perdu tout espoir en un retour à de meilleurs sentiments, et menaçait en passant, sans appuyer, de transporter en d'autres mains ce protectorat des missions qui, si je ne me trompe, nous appartient depuis le XVII^e siècle, et qui tente assez l'empereur d'Allemagne pour qu'il fasse tout exprès venir de Berlin des perruques poudrées, afin d'ajouter à l'importance de ses visites au Vatican.

J'ai dit que le pape lui-même admettait l'utilité d'une nouvelle réglementation de l'état des congrégations: n'est-ce pas ce qu'il faut conclure de cette phrase de sa lettre au cardinal Richard?—

'La France entretient avec le St Siège des rapports amicaux, fondés sur un traité solennel. Si donc les inconvénients que l'on indique ont sur tel ou tel point quelque réalité, la voie est toute ouverte pour les signaler au St Siège, qui est tout disposé à les prendre en sérieux examen, et à leur appliquer, s'il y a lieu, des remèdes opportuns.'

N'est-ce pas là reconnaître qu'il faut remédier à un état de choses devenu inacceptable? Sans doute les remèdes de Léon XIII n'eussent pas pris la forme de ceux que M. Combes juge d'une efficacité absolue, et dont je vais parler maintenant.

La loi Waldeck Rousseau, pour produire les résultats qu'on avait lieu d'en espérer, aurait dû être appliquée avec beaucoup de tact, et une connaissance subtile du tempérament de la France. Il fallait dix ans et de la mesure pour la mener à bien et sans provoquer de dangereuses secousses dans l'opinion du pays. On a procédé autrement; et les résultats sont tels que, dès maintenant, on peut dire que ça a été un grand tort. Une des premières conséquences de ces brutalités inutiles et gauches s'aperçoit dans la manœuvre politique grâce à laquelle les adversaires du ministère sont arrivés à faire baisser la rente de ce pays si formidablement riche, et à répandre dans la petite bourgeoisie l'inquiétude qui a provoqué le retrait des fonds des caisses d'épargne. De

tels symptômes de mécontentement valent qu'on s'en occupe; et, s'il faut juger sévèrement ceux qui par haine de parti n'hésitent pas à jeter le discrédit sur leur pays, encore faut-il reconnaître qu'à défaut des moyens employés pour la satisfaire, les raisons de leur irritation sont défendables.

On a ordonné aux congrégations de demander à être autorisées. Certaines ne l'ont pas fait, et entr'autres les Jésuites, qui sous aucun régime n'ont consenti à subir cette loi de surveillance; mais une énorme quantité d'ordres se sont soumis et ont présenté leur demande en temps voulu. Ils avaient le droit d'espérer que leurs causes seraient examinées une à une; il n'en a pas été ainsi. C'est la Chambre qui doit se prononcer, accepter ou rejeter les demandes; on comprend de reste qu'elle n'a pas le temps de peser soigneusement les raisons de chacune; et on a lieu de regretter que ces demandes n'aient pas été plutôt déferées au conseil des ministres, qui les eût repoussées ou autorisées par décret. Voici un exemple de la manière dont les choses se passèrent: 54 demandes ayant été présentées, on classa les ordres en trois groupes—prédicants, enseignants, et commerçants; on ne s'inquiéta pas si parmi les enseignants il en était de missionnaires, et d'hospitaliers parmi les prédicants; et un vote général repoussa les demandes presque en totalité. Le fait ayant soulevé des protestations même dans la majorité républicaine, le président du conseil dû, pour en vaincre la résistance, déclarer que les mêmes demandes qui avaient été rejetées par le vote général pourraient être reproduites. Voici déjà une façon de procéder singulièrement sommaire, et dont le sens de la justice, en même temps que le goût de la liberté, est heurté d'une façon déplaisante.

Mais il y a mieux—ou pire! Les religieuses des écoles ont reçu ordre de se séculariser; elles ont obéi; elles ont la preuve écrite qu'elles cessent d'appartenir à une communauté; on leur interdit d'enseigner dans l'endroit où elles enseignaient en tant que religieuses. On accepte que celles qui tenaient une école à St Germain aillent en tenir une au Vésinet, faute de quoi on les proscrit. Ici l'arbitraire prend à tel point la figure de la bêtise qu'on ne les distingue plus. On poursuit, non seulement les religieuses qui pourtant ont obéi à la loi en se sécularisant,

mais aussi ceux qui leur donnent asile. On supprime le traitement d'un évêque (Mgr. Turinaz) parce qu'il a fait prêcher le jour de Pâques un Jésuite depuis longtemps sécularisé. Enfin on commet l'irréparable maladresse d'expulser les religieuses, même celles qui ne demandaient qu'à se soumettre à la loi. Certes, il y a des moines d'affaires et des moines ligueurs, comme les a nommés M. Waldeck Rousseau; et il y a des moines journalistes, médiocres français pour la plupart, agitateurs dangereux, ennemis sans merci, et de large conscience quant aux moyens à employer; mais personne n'a jamais dit que les sœurs de charité fissent de la politique! Un homme ambitieux peut aller au cloître comme vers un moyen de réaliser une brillante carrière; une femme n'y va que pour occuper son cœur; ce sont des maternités déviées, ces profonds dévouements. Elles ne gagnent rien à ces simples vies obscures qu'elles choisissent; et, si elles aussi sont trop riches pour le bien de l'État, on pouvait au moins agir envers elles comme a fait Napoléon, qui disait: 'Mon intention est de ne point vouloir de couvents de religieuses, mais sur ce point je ne vois pas d'inconvénients à ce que les anciennes religieuses finissent leur vie en commun' (Napoléon à Fouché, 18 germinal, an X).

Peut-être Napoléon avait-il plus d'esprit que M. Combes, qui ne semble pas savoir qu'en France ce n'est pas faire de bonne besogne que se donner l'air de persécuter les femmes. On ouvre par là une issue à trop de belles déclamations éloquentes, dont ce pays chevaleresque, et tellement sensible au verbe, est tout remué. Il aurait mieux valu, sans doute, ne pas provoquer les scènes piteuses qui se sont produites en si grand nombre que les journaux pour en rendre compte ont créé la rubrique 'Expulsion des Congrégations,' et où on voit les sœurs quitter leurs couvents au milieu d'amis pleins de zèle, de femmes du monde que tente un héroïsme—sans grand risque—d'hommes du monde qui pensent qu'en renonçant à leurs habitudes mesurées pour crier un peu et gesticuler dans la rue, ils ébranlent les fondements de la République. Toutes ces personnes, que le dévouement et l'indignation agitent à l'extrême, reconduisent vers des voitures ou à des trains les pauvres religieuses ahuries et tristes, chargent leurs bras de bouquets, fort encombrants pour la route, tandis que la populace hurle des injures—à

l'adresse du gouvernement, ou à celle de l'Église, selon les régions—et que la police ou la troupe requise par les autorités, pour éviter des embarras plus graves, prend un style fâcheux de peloton d'exécution.

'La loi était une loi de contrôle, on en fait une loi d' "exclusion,"' disent les républicains qui ont la tête froide ; d' 'assassinat' disent les catholiques—en tous cas une loi qui prend toutes les apparences de l'injustice. Cette façon soudaine de ne tenir aucun compte du fait antique et puissant qu'est le catholicisme est une singulière imprudence, pour ne pas dire plus. La prodigieuse reviviscence de la religion pendant le XIX^e siècle, en réaction contre les brutalités de la Révolution, devrait instruire les hommes d'aujourd'hui. Et puis la France a la passion de la légalité, et on a l'air de sortir de la légalité. Rien ne sert plus pour défendre, contre cette rage d'en finir tout de suite, ceux et celles qui pouvaient s'imaginer être protégés.

Il y a deux ans, M. Delcassé promettait au St Siège que la loi nouvelle n'aurait pas d'effet rétroactif, et que les écoles antérieures à 1901 seraient épargnées : en 1903 on oblige le bey de Tunis à fermer des écoles antérieures non seulement à 1901 mais même au protectorat de la France. À l'asile d'aliénés de Charenton les religieuses Augustines avaient lieu de se croire en sûreté, garanties par un traité passé en 1852 entre leur ordre et le directeur de l'établissement, traité approuvé par le ministre de l'intérieur : on les expulse sans plus de commentaire. Et combien d'autres !

Après avoir essayé de montrer le danger économique de la mainmorte, il convient de montrer l'inconvénient économique de la brusque façon dont on procède. S'il a fallu trente ans d'effort à l'esprit républicain pour obtenir la loi de 1901, c'est qu'elle attaquait des intérêts multiples et que les répercussions en devaient être lointaines ; c'est dire assez qu'on ne pouvait l'appliquer en quelques semaines, ni en quelques mois. Il fallait, non moins que le problème moral, envisager le problème financier. Chose étrange ! on n'y a point songé ; au moins il semble que ce soit ainsi.

Déjà on se rend compte que la liquidation des biens congréganistes ne donnera pas le résultat qu'on en avait sans doute espéré. La plupart des biens seront réclamés

par les ayants droit, et beaucoup seront dénaturés—il n'est que trop facile de le prévoir. De toutes façons l'État se trouvera en face d'une forte note à payer ; la suppression de l'enseignement religieux l'oblige à pourvoir à l'instruction de 150,000 garçons et de 600,000 filles. Il est en mesure de placer dans ses écoles une partie des garçons, mais il n'en va pas de même pour les filles. Ayant à pourvoir au placement de 144,200 écoliers répartis dans 1512 écoles, il faudra qu'on aménage des bâtiments dans 296 communes et qu'on en construise de nouveaux dans 336 autres. Avec l'acquisition nécessaire des mobiliers scolaires, la dépense totale s'élève à 13,550,000 francs ; de plus le traitement des nouveaux instituteurs grève le budget d'une charge annuelle de 2,300,000 francs. Pour les filles, la somme totale des dépenses de constructions, aménagements, etc., est de 46,336,500 francs, et le traitement des institutrices de 7,543,195 francs.*

L'application de la loi est si mauvaise, et, il faut le dire aussi, tellement vaine, que pour se tirer de la situation qu'il s'est faite le gouvernement en est réduit à espérer que des écoles libres se rouvriront pour le décharger un peu. Heureusement c'est ce qui se produit ; sur 3000 établissements congréganistes fermés de juillet 1902 à août 1903, il s'en est rouvert déjà 1400 (août 1903). Mais le détestable procédé n'est-il pas jugé par ce fait que ceux qui en usent doivent désirer qu'il ne réussisse qu'en apparence ? Car qu'y aura-t-il de changé dans l'enseignement donné par des religieux sécularisés ? Rien, sinon qu'ils y apporteront de nouvelles colères et de plus vifs espoirs de revanche.

Sur les 60 millions à dépenser tout de suite, la moyenne de la subvention de l'État étant de 43 %, celui-ci n'aurait à verser que 26 millions environ, le reste incombant aux communes. On comprend la résistance et l'irritation produites partout ; les conseils généraux en ont été les interprètes dans les départements. Mais les représentants du gouvernement n'ont rien voulu entendre ; et devant les critiques faites par les conseillers généraux, on a vu

* Ces calculs ne comprennent pas les dépenses qui seraient nécessaires si on supprimait les frères de la Doctrine Chrétienne, qui se réclament d'une autorisation qui leur a été donnée par un article du décret du 19 mars 1808. Si leurs écoles disparaissaient, l'État aurait à supporter une charge d'environ 27 millions.

plusieurs préfets se lever sans répondre et quitter la séance, agissant ainsi avec tant de symétrie qu'on a tout lieu de croire qu'ils obéissaient à des instructions venues de plus haut. Dans un grand nombre de communes le mécontentement s'est traduit en faits, soit que les maires aient donné leur démission, ou qu'au contraire, indignés du mauvais vouloir opposé à la loi par les congréganistes et une partie de la population, ils aient eu recours à de singuliers abus d'autorité, comme d'interdire toute manifestation du culte en dehors des églises, y compris celle qui consiste pour le prêtre à accompagner les morts au cimetière. Toutes ces choses ne sont pas propres à tenir le pays en paix.

Pour les hôpitaux, les religieuses représentaient aussi une indiscutable économie: 'Dans les 17 hôpitaux de Paris (écrivait jadis le Dr Bourneville) il y avait 391 religieuses, qui coûtaient annuellement 140,550 francs; elles ont été remplacées par 452 laïques qui coûtent 332,710 francs.' Les Augustines de l'hospice des fous à Charenton reçoivent chacune 200 francs par an pour leur vêtement; la laïcisation représentera pour ce seul établissement une dépense de 15,000 francs.

Voici donc qu'on a produit une irritation profonde, et ouvert une nouvelle source de dépenses; d'ailleurs on n'a guère atteint les ordres perturbateurs. Les Jésuites, nous le savons bien, ne sont pas partis; ils ne partent jamais! les Assomptionnistes sont toujours là, sous d'autres costumes mais avec les mêmes cœurs acharnés, et de la haine justifiée maintenant. Ce n'était guère la peine d'avoir subi tant de convulsions, dont le pays garde encore la fiébrilité douloureuse, d'avoir fait un si vigoureux et tenace effort pour se rapprocher d'un idéal de justice et de liberté, et de tant haïr enfin l'esprit de l'Église, pour en appliquer les méthodes dans ce qu'elles ont de pire. On se débarrasse du dogme catholique et de son oppression pour imposer le dogme républicain et la sienne; où est l'avantage? On devait contenir l'Église, non la détruire, et, quoi qu'on voulut faire enfin, ne pas user contre elle des méthodes d'intolérance et de fanatisme qu'on lui reprochait. M. Waldeck Rousseau a dit: 'Si le catholicisme proscrit le libre examen, la libre pensée ne saurait proscrire la liberté de croire.' Évidemment, et cela tombe

sous le sens. Malheureusement, dans bien des cas, la libre pensée s'exerce surtout à empêcher ses adversaires de penser librement. Et quelles contradictions inexplicables ne relève-t-on pas à chaque instant dans le système outrancier adopté par M. Combes ! Pour quelles raisons impossibles à discerner ferme-t-on une certaine chapelle et laisse-t-on l'autre ouverte ? Sur quoi se base l'athéisme et l'irréligion du gouvernement, pour distinguer entre les deux ? Pourquoi expulser les Chartreux et laisser Lourdes continuer son commerce ? S'il est une manifestation étalée et flagrante de ce qu'on appelle la superstition catholique, n'est-ce pas Lourdes ? Mais les intérêts de la région ! répond-on. Bien ; mais il y en avait d'autres ; la ville de Grenoble perd cinq millions par an du départ des Chartreux. Mais les raisons politiques, ajoute-t-on, les prochaines élections. Sans doute, mais ce n'est pas seulement autour de Lourdes que le mécontentement des intérêts lésés est capable de se manifester aux prochaines élections ; il est à craindre qu'on en ait de trop bonnes preuves. Et tous ceux-là y songent, à qui l'idéal républicain est cher, et qui souhaitent qu'il aille, malgré les défaillances des hommes—qui passent—vers une réalisation toujours plus complète et plus belle de l'âme de la France. Ils n'oublient pas que, moines d'affaires et moines ligueurs, aucun n'a désarmé ni ne désarmera, et que l'adversaire qui sait qu'il n'a plus rien à espérer est un plus dangereux adversaire.

La loi de 1901 était nécessaire, il fallait pour qu'elle fût féconde lui adjoindre le grand auxiliaire de toute réussite, le temps, qui ne respecte pas ce qui a été fait sans lui. Il fallait frapper les ordres qui refusaient de se soumettre à la loi, c'était justice, et laisser les autres s'éteindre en leur interdisant de se recruter ; ou encore les considérer comme des sociétés qui cessent d'exister à la disparition de leur chef, et les dissoudre chaque fois qu'un des supérieurs fut venu à mourir. Ainsi on aurait graduellement, sagement, et sûrement résolu le problème et entravé le développement des couvents, refuge des cœurs délicats aux époques de l'histoire où la vie est hasardeuse et menacée, les mœurs brutales et l'idéal offusqué, mais dont la raison d'être diminue et disparaît en un temps où l'esprit trouve partout l'emploi de son activité, où la personne humaine libérée conquiert toute sa dignité, où chacun a envers les autres le devoir croissant de vivre

toute sa vie et d'apporter à sa patrie la contribution de ses énergies totales.

The following brief account of the suppression of the English Benedictine College at Douai is added as an illustration of the latter portion of the foregoing remarks.—EDITOR.

As an incident in the general suppression of the religious congregations in France, the closing of the English Benedictine College at Douai has taken place without much notice. There are, however, some features peculiar to it that should not be uninteresting to Englishmen. It must be premised that the college was wholly and entirely English. The religious community of men who furnished the masters and administrators, and the entire body of students, were British subjects, no French boy or youth or master being allowed to be an inmate of the establishment. Moreover, although bearing to the full their share in the general taxation, the monks neither exercised nor claimed, at any time, the right of voting in the elections, municipal or governmental. The property, consisting of the college, chapel, and other buildings, was acknowledged to be British, although, since 1826, it had been under the administration of the 'Bureau des Fondations Anglaises,' appointed to look after the remnant of property belonging to the English colleges which the French Revolution had spared. Some years ago, in order, as we thought, to render the legal status of the Douai College indefeasible, we took a lease of all the premises from this Bureau. This lease, which still has many years to run, was drawn up with the approval of the Minister of the Interior, and is signed by him, by the President of the Republic, M. Carnot, and by the Minister of Instruction. Relying upon this and upon the fact that for more than three-quarters of a century we had been treated by the highest educational officials in the government of France as a college, and trusting in the faith of the French nation to keep its contracts, we from time to time made many additions and necessary alterations to the buildings; the last being a wing which alone cost a benefactor some 10,000*l*. For all these not one penny of French money had been expended; everything was paid for, and the whole building furnished and maintained, and all alterations and additions carried out, with English money alone.

This being the state of the case, when the recent law against the religious congregations in France was passed, we did not imagine that it would in any way affect this purely English establishment. To make everything secure, however,

on the advice of M. Waldeck Rousseau, who had stated that his bill was not a bill of destruction and confiscation, but one by which the religious bodies could obtain a legalised status, we applied for formal authorisation. Informally, we had been assured by our own Embassy in Paris that, even if authorisation were refused, our moveable property, being the property of British subjects, could, of course, not be touched; and, a specific question being put as to the organ in the chapel, which a friend had presented a few years ago at the cost of 1000*l.*, we were assured that we should be able to remove all that kind of property. Subsequently we received, even in the early months of this year, assurances, conveyed to us by officials of the town, from members of the government, that the law would not affect us. It was, therefore, with profound astonishment that we learnt one day that a liquidator had been appointed to take possession of the college and all its belongings. Literally only a few minutes after we had received information of this by a telegram from the British Embassy, the liquidator was announced. He had come prepared to place seals upon everything, but was forced to retire by our lawyer, who pointed out that four clear days' notice was required of the rejection of our claim for authorisation, and of his appointment. After the lapse of the legal interval he reappeared; and, although the college was allowed three months to close its business, the liquidator claimed during that interval to be the legal possessor. Our appeals to the British Foreign Office to protect our interests were unavailing; and, when the case was brought up in Parliament during the last session, the authorities defended their want of action on the unheard-of principle that, if English subjects voluntarily go to live in a foreign country, their country cannot undertake to defend their property and interests there. Recent cases in Venezuela and elsewhere seem to throw considerable doubt upon this as a principle of British diplomacy. In conclusion it should be borne in mind that we never made any claim to remain in France against the wish of the French government, but merely asked for protection of our moveable property, and for compensation for money expended on the faith of the French government's repeated dealings with us, and especially of an unexpired lease signed by the President of the French Republic.

FRANCIS A. GASQUET,
(Abbot-President of the English Benedictines.)

Art. X.—MR MORLEY'S LIFE OF GLADSTONE.

1. *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone.* By John Morley. Three volumes. London: Macmillan, 1903.
2. *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone.* By H. W. Paul. London: Smith, Elder, 1901.
3. *The Life and Correspondence of the Right Hon. Hugh C. E. Childers, 1827–1896.* By his son, Lieut.-Col. Spencer Childers, C.B. Two volumes. London: Murray, 1901.
4. *Studies in Contemporary Biography.* By James Bryce. London: Macmillan, 1903.

IT is a commonplace with some critics that Mr Morley made a great mistake when he deserted literature for politics. The criticism is not a very profound one, though it is natural on the part of those who, having no sympathy with Mr Morley's political views, may very well think that he was less likely to do harm as a man of letters than as a man of affairs. Even so, however, it is rather short-sighted. To begin with, it is very doubtful whether the influence of the writer is less than that of the politician. In the second place, Mr Morley has always been something more than a man of letters. All his serious contributions to literature have been inspired by lofty political ideals. In him the man of letters has always assumed the garb of the political evangelist—the evangelist of a political gospel which is not ours, but which, associated as it is with a literary faculty of rare felicity and power, a breadth of culture rarely attained by politicians, and a personal character which commands the respect of all his opponents, is and has long been a force to be reckoned with in English public life. Besides, Mr Morley has never entirely deserted literature for politics; he has brought his political training to bear on literature; witness his admirable studies of Sir Robert Walpole and of Oliver Cromwell, books which abound in wise saws and pregnant reflections that could never have been inspired in the study. They are the fine flower of political experience, ripened in the senate and the market-place, quickened by the habit of dealing directly with men, and perfected by rare literary skill.

But it is by his 'Life of William Ewart Gladstone,'

just published, that Mr Morley may claim to be finally judged both as a man of letters and as a man of affairs. There are few forms of literature so difficult to succeed in as biography; there are perhaps none so difficult as political biography; and probably no political biography that ever was written was more difficult to write well than that of Mr Gladstone. Has Mr Morley written it well? The answer will generally depend in some measure on the point of view and the political and personal prepossessions of the critic. Those who think that Mr Gladstone's political aims were mischievous and his political conduct flagitious, who regard him as a time-serving demagogue and hypocrite, driven to tortuous courses by the stings of a restless and overmastering ambition, will hardly approve of a biography which represents him throughout as a statesman inspired by a singularly lofty sense of public duty, a man of profound and unimpeachable piety, measuring and judging all his acts by his own high standard of Christian ethics, and seeking to bring the policy of his country into conformity with the same lofty ideals. But no impartial and competent critic, freeing his mind from prejudices and prepossessions which have too often blinded literary judgments, will hesitate to declare that Mr Morley has discharged his supremely difficult task with consummate skill and discretion. In all his long and brilliant career as a man of letters, he has seldom, perhaps never, written with a more sustained ethical fervour or a more triumphant literary dexterity, with a shrewder insight into motive and character, a defter adjustment of literary and historical 'values,' or a more judicious handling of materials. Throughout the work he displays a serene and charitable temper, always seeking to do justice to opponents, never imputing unworthy motives to them, and perhaps only in one case—that of the Special Commission—giving the rein to a *sæva indignatio* which it is permissible alike to a good man to feel and to other good men not to share with him. It would not be fair to the author to attribute this remarkable freedom from party spirit to the influence of Queen Victoria; but it is only right to record, as Mr Morley does himself, that, when he applied to her Majesty for the use of certain documents not accessible without her sanction, the Queen, in complying with his request,

'added a message strongly impressing on me that the work I was about to undertake should not be handled in the narrow way of party. This injunction,' continues Mr Morley, 'represents my own clear view of the spirit in which the history of a career so memorable as Mr Gladstone's should be composed. That, to be sure, is not at all inconsistent with our regarding party feeling, in its honourable sense, as entirely the reverse of an infirmity' (Preface, p. vii).

There are three aspects in which Mr Morley's great work can, and in the long run must, be appreciated—its aspect as a work of literary art; its psychological aspect as a sympathetic appreciation of one of the greatest personalities of his time; its historical aspect as presenting a survey, which must needs be concise without being inadequate, of the long series of political events associated with Mr Gladstone's career and subjected to his influence. These several aspects are so organically connected in the biographical synthesis that they cannot be wholly dissociated in the critical analysis. No biography which neglects any one of them can be held to attain to the highest order of merit; but, if due allowance be made for Mr Morley's personal sympathies and political prepossessions, never suppressed and yet never obtruded, we shall hardly place Mr Morley's biography in any class lower than the first. It is a great portrait of a great man.

The biography is long, even as biographies go now; but its length cannot be said to be excessive, in view of the unusual duration of Mr Gladstone's public career, the unparalleled fullness of his life, and the wide range of his interests. It has been said that only a syndicate could write the life of such a man, and only an encyclopædia could contain it. Mr Morley has accomplished the work single-handed; he has completed it in three years; and he has compressed the results into three volumes. Further than this compression could not profitably go. His words are seldom wasted. They are the distilled essence of documents innumerable, the condensed record of one of the most active and many-sided careers in British history, a brief epitome of more than half a century crowded with great political events, unexampled in social and economic change.

Nevertheless, severely as Mr Morley has condensed his materials, he retains at all times perfect mastery over

them. His biography is no mere bald and jejune calendar of incidents, controversies, or events, but an articulated narrative, well proportioned in its parts, instinct with life and movement, in which the rare but necessary documents to be quoted fall naturally into their places as touches conducive to the completeness of the portrait. In style too the book is admirably suited to its subject. The dominant note is a grave and lofty dignity, but lighter tones are not infrequent; and their introduction is well attuned to the spirit of the whole composition. It abounds in felicitous phrases and well chosen epithets; and there is no lack of those pungent apophthegms and pregnant reflections which bespeak the man of letters who has himself handled great affairs. As a single specimen of Mr Morley's graver manner we may take his description of the scene on the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill.

'Of the chief comrades or rivals of the minister's own generation—the strong administrators, the eager and accomplished debaters, the sagacious leaders—the only survivor now comparable to him in eloquence or in influence was Mr Bright. That illustrious man seldom came into the House in those distracted days; and on this memorable occasion his stern and noble head was to be seen in dim obscurity. Various as were the emotions in other regions of the House, in one quarter rejoicing was unmingled. There, at least, was no doubt and no misgiving. There, pallid and tranquil, sat the Irish leader, whose hard insight, whose patience, energy, and spirit of command, had achieved this astounding result, and done that which he had vowed to his countrymen that he would assuredly be able to do. On the benches round him, genial excitement rose almost to tumult. Well it might. For the first time since the Union, the Irish case was at last to be pressed in all its force and strength, in every aspect of policy and of conscience, by the most powerful Englishman then alive.

'More striking than the audience was the man; more striking than the multitude of eager onlookers from the shore was the rescuer with deliberate valour facing the floods ready to wash him down; the veteran Ulysses who, after more than half a century of combat, service, toil, thought it not too late to try a further "work of noble note." In the hands of such a master of the instrument, the theme might easily have lent itself to one of those displays of exalted

passion which the House had marvelled at in more than one of Mr Gladstone's speeches on the Turkish question, or heard with religious reverence in his speech on the Affirmation Bill in 1883. What the occasion now required was that passion should burn low, and reasoned persuasion hold up the guiding lamp. An elaborate scheme was to be unfolded, an unfamiliar policy to be explained and vindicated. Of that best kind of eloquence which dispenses with declamation, this was a fine and sustained example. There was a deep, rapid, steady, on-flowing volume of argument, exposition, exhortation. Every hard or bitter stroke was avoided. Now and again a fervid note thrilled the ear and lifted all hearts. But political oratory is action, not words—action, character, will, conviction, purpose, personality. As this eager muster of men underwent the enchantment of periods exquisite in their balance and modulation, the compulsion of his flashing glance and animated gesture, what stirred and commanded them was the recollection of national service, the thought of the speaker's mastering purpose, his unflagging resolution and strenuous will, his strength of thew and sinew well tried in long years of resounding war, his unquenched conviction that the just cause can never fail. Few are the heroic moments in our parliamentary politics, but this was one' (iii, 311-2).

Even the bitterest adversary of the policy here referred to must acknowledge that this is literary work of the highest order. We may follow it up with a few detached quotations illustrating Mr Morley's felicities of expression and appreciation, premising at the same time that they lose more than half their effect by being detached from their context. Here, for a first example, is a shrewd attempt to explain the baffling antinomies of Mr Gladstone's personality.

'An illustrious opponent once described him, by way of hitting his singular duality of disposition, as an ardent Italian in the custody of a Scotsman. It is easy to make too much of race, but when we are puzzled by Mr Gladstone's seeming contrarieties of temperament, his union of impulse with caution, of passion with circumspection, of pride and fire with self-control, of Ossianic flight with a steady foothold on the solid earth, we may perhaps find a sort of explanation in thinking of him as a highlander in the custody of a lowlander' (i, 18).

Other examples we have noted must, for lack of space

be cited with very little comment. As a rule, however, they speak for themselves. 'He soon discovered how hard it is to adjust to the many angles of an English political party the seamless mantle of ecclesiastical predominance.' Is not that an epitome of a certain famous 'Chapter of Autobiography'? 'There is plenty of evidence, besides Mr Gladstone's case, that simplicity of character is no hindrance to subtlety of intellect'—a hard saying to those who saw in Mr Gladstone nothing but a hypocrite, but full of truth and insight nevertheless. 'Severer than any battle in Parliament is a long struggle inside a Cabinet'—a pregnant *arcanum imperii* indeed! This, again, of Mr Gladstone's famous declaration on the franchise in 1864: 'One of the fated words had been spoken that gather up the wandering forces of time and occasion and precipitate new eras.' Or this in a large-minded apology for the tactics of Disraeli in 1867:—

'We always do best to seek rational explanations in large affairs. . . . The secret of the strange reversal in 1867 of all that had been said, attempted, and done in 1866, would seem to be that the tide of public opinion had suddenly swelled to flood.' It is easy, as Mr Morley says in another context, to label this with the ill-favoured name of opportunism. 'Yet if an opportunist be defined as a statesman who declines to attempt to do a thing until he believes that it can really be done, what is this but to call him a man of common-sense?'

It cannot be said, however, that Mr Morley is always successful in defence. Those who blamed Mr Gladstone's offer in 1874 to do away with the income-tax if the country gave him a majority, Mr Morley dubs 'critics of the peevish school who cry for better bread than can be made of political wheat.' He follows up his sally with an enumeration of cases in which other ministers have taken a like course without incurring the same censure. The argument is plausible but not very cogent, in view of Mr Gladstone's own avowal to Lord Granville that he was seeking to discover measures likely 'materially to mend the position of the party for an impending election,' and that he thought such measures might best be found in the domain of finance. There is a ring of party opportunism about this which ill consorts with a lofty and disinterested statesmanship. At the same time it is clear

that income-tax repeal was no desperate expedient hastily adopted by a minister *in extremis*. He had taken the Exchequer into his own hands, and in the previous summer had instituted inquiries which led the officials concerned to surmise that he was nursing some design of dealing with the income-tax. He had, as he records in his diary, communicated his ideas 'in deep secrecy' to Mr Cardwell, and told him they were 'based upon the abolition of income-tax and sugar duties, with partial compensation from spirit and death duties.' At the end of September he wrote in the diary, 'I want eight millions to handle!' 'So much,' says Mr Morley, 'for the charitable tale that he only bethought him of the income-tax when desperately hunting for a card to play at a general election.'

On the Midlothian campaign, Mr Morley remarks:—

'To disparage eloquence is to depreciate mankind; and when men say that Mr Gladstone and Midlothian were no better than a resplendent mistake, they forget how many objects of our reverence stand condemned by implication in their verdict; they have not thought out how many of the faiths and principles that have been the brightest lamps in the track of human advance they are extinguishing by the same unkind and freezing breath. One should take care lest in quenching the spirit of Midlothian, we leave the sovereign mastery of the world to Machiavelli' (ii, 594).

We may not all concur in the particular judgment here pronounced, but its spirit must command the sympathy of all generous minds. So, again, men still differ as to the action of Mr Gladstone and his Cabinet in the sinister tragedy of Majuba; but few will withhold their assent from Mr Morley's scathing censure on the fatal preliminary dawdling which led directly to the catastrophe. 'So a fresh page was turned in the story of loitering unwisdom.' That we may not have to revert to a painful subject, we may here quote Mr Morley's final judgment on the whole transaction:—

'Some have argued that we ought to have brought up an overwhelming force, to demonstrate that we were able to beat them, before we made peace. Unfortunately, demonstrations of this species easily turn into provocations, and talk of this kind mostly comes from those who believe, not that peace

was made in the wrong way, but that a peace giving their country back to the Boers ought never to have been made at all, on any terms or in any way. This was not the point from which either Cabinet or Parliament started. The government had decided that annexation had been an error. The Boers had proposed inquiry. The government assented on condition that the Boers dispersed. Without waiting a reasonable time for a reply, our general was worsted in a rash and trivial attack. Did this cancel our proffered bargain? The point was simple and unmistakable, though party heat at home, race passion in the colony, and our everlasting human proneness to mix up different questions, and to answer one point by arguments that belong to another, all combined to produce a confusion of mind that a certain school of partisans have traded upon ever since. Strange in mighty nations is moral cowardice, disguised as a Roman pride. All the more may we admire the moral courage of the minister. For moral courage may be needed even where aversion to bloodshed fortunately happens to coincide with high prudence and sound policy of state' (iii, 43, 44).

We presume that Mr Morley means that 'high prudence and sound policy' were displayed in the surrender of 1881. How utterly we disagree with him, it is hardly necessary to remind readers of this Review. But it is not our purpose on this occasion to combat Mr Morley's opinions; we prefer to give our readers, with as little adverse comment as may be, some notion of his book. Mr Morley gives a cogent practical reason why the Cabinet were so strongly inclined to come to an understanding on the basis of the Boer overtures made by Kruger before Majuba, but after Colley's reverses at Laing's Nek and the Ingogo River,

'Any other decision would have broken up the government, for, on at least one division in the House on Transvaal affairs, Mr Bright and Mr Chamberlain, along with three other ministers not in the Cabinet, had abstained from voting' (iii, 85).

The conclusion is, then, that the interests of the country were sacrificed to the cohesion of the Cabinet.

'Ireland never blows over,' is another of Mr Morley's pregnant comments in recording how other 'rising storms' in the Cabinet seemed to have blown over in the late spring of 1885, when the powerful government

of 1880 was already tottering to its fall. It had, as Mr Gladstone said himself, 'no moral force behind it.' Yet his buoyancy and resource were, as Mr Morley says, never more wonderful than at this juncture:—

'Between the middle of April and the middle of May, he jots down, with half rueful humour, the names of no fewer than nine members of the Cabinet who, within that period, for one reason or another, and at one moment or another, appeared to contemplate resignation; that is to say, a majority. Of one meeting he said playfully to a colleague, "A very fair Cabinet to-day—only three resignations." The large packets of copious letters of this date, written and received, show him a minister of unalterable patience, unruffled self-command; inexhaustible in resource, catching at every straw from the resource of others, indefatigable in bringing men of divergent opinions within friendly reach of one another; of tireless ingenuity in minimising differences and convincing recalcitrants that what they took for a yawning gulf was, in fact, no more than a narrow trench that any decent political gymnast ought to be ashamed not to be able to vault over' (iii, 185).

'The point-blank is not for all occasions, and only a simpleton can think otherwise'—this of the ambiguities and obscurities of Mr Gladstone's utterances during the election of 1885. 'You need greater qualities' (said Cardinal De Retz) 'to be a good party leader than to be emperor of the universe. Ireland is not that part of the universe in which this is the least true'—this of Parnell's leadership in 1885 and of Ireland's acceptance of it. It may here be noted that a confidential draft of the first Home Rule Bill was entrusted to Parnell before its introduction, with permission to communicate it to a few of his colleagues, accompanied by a solemn warning against premature divulcation.

'The draft' (says Mr Morley) 'was duly returned, and not a word leaked out. Some time afterwards Mr Parnell recalled the incident to me. "Three of the men to whom I showed the draft were newspaper men, and they were poor men, and any newspaper would have given them a thousand pounds for it. No very wonderful virtue, you may say. But how many of your House of Commons would believe it?"' (iii, 320).

'No reformer' (says Mr Morley) 'is fit for his task who suffers himself to be frightened off by the excesses

of an extreme wing'—this of Mr Gladstone's attitude towards the 'plan of campaign.' It seems to go nearer to 'the standards of Machiavel' than is Mr Morley's wont, or than quite befits his estimate of Mr Gladstone's lofty and uncompromising love of righteousness.

There is no solution of the problem of Mr Gladstone's character and personality to be found in any compact or simple formula. We may call him hypocrite or saint, according as we judge him harshly or kindly. We may contrast Lord Salisbury's 'a great Christian statesman' with Kinglake's earlier and less generous judgment, 'a good man—a good man in the worst sense of the word'; or, if in cynical mood, we may combine the two estimates. Mr Bryce says, in the loyal estimate of his former chief included in his 'Biographical Studies': 'That he was possessed of boundless energy and brilliant eloquence all are agreed; but agreement went no further.' We must, however, demur to the latter clause. We should have thought that agreement went at least so far as to acknowledge that Mr Gladstone was really a great man—great in intellectual power, great in moral enthusiasm, however misapplied sometimes, great in parliamentary aptitude and resource, great in more than one department of political effort and achievement, even if all his more questionable enterprises be left out of the account or reckoned on the adverse side. It is true that, like all great men of action, and perhaps in larger measure than most, he was gifted with rare powers of self-persuasion—with a faith in his own judgment and rectitude of purpose which was seldom shared by his critics, and not always by his friends. 'The right honourable gentleman,' said Mr Forster on a memorable occasion, 'can persuade most people of most things; he can persuade himself of almost anything.' He was undoubtedly convinced, as Cromwell was—and it is not the only point of likeness between him and Cromwell—that he was the man to save the country; and in such men it is not always easy, for themselves or for others, to distinguish between personal ambition and the highest and most disinterested motives. It is just the combination of these impulses that, in a sense, constitutes, or largely contributes to, their greatness.

Mr Bryce goes on to say that

'one section of the nation accused him of sophistry, of unwisdom, of a want of patriotism, of a lust for power'; while 'the other section not only repelled these charges, but admired in him a conscientiousness and a moral enthusiasm such as no political leader has shown for centuries' (p. 411).

There is perhaps no complete reconciliation of these conflicting judgments, none, at least, for a generation which knew Mr Gladstone in the flesh and still burns either with enthusiasm or with indignation. Lord Rosebery says of the Irish question that it has never passed into history because it has never passed out of politics. So we may say of Mr Gladstone that he too cannot yet pass into history because he has not yet passed out of politics. Midlothian, Majuba, Kilmainham, Khartoum, the surrender to Parnell, the conversion to Home Rule—there is passion, partisanship, and fierce contention still glowing in the very words. Whether we study the spirited biography of Mr Herbert Paul—the work of an avowed Gladstonian, but fairly impartial, as befits the neutral pages of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' in which it first appeared—or the sympathetic but critical analysis of Mr Bryce, or the more laboured and copious, but withal temperate and reasoned *apologia* of Mr Morley, we still feel that the time is not yet for a final and judicial closing of the bitter controversies which such a character and such a career provoked in such abundance. Nevertheless it is only a man still heated with the passions of bygone conflicts that can now seriously question Mr Gladstone's fundamental sincerity and uprightness, or doubt that, in whatever walk of life his lot had been cast, his strenuous industry, his amazing versatility, and his commanding intellectual powers, must have brought him to the top.

'I should like to know,' cried Huxley, when he met him casually at Darwin's house, 'what would keep such a man as that back. Why, put him in the middle of a moor, with nothing in the world but his shirt, and you could not prevent him being anything he liked' (ii, 562).

And Huxley, as Mr Morley says, was as far as possible from being a Gladstonian. Indeed he is reported later

as saying, 'Here is a man with the greatest intellect in Europe, and yet he debases it by simply following majorities and the crowd.' Did he? It is a digression here to give Mr Morley's comment on this pungent expression of a very general opinion, but we may cite it as showing that there is at least something to be said on the other side.

'All this is the exact opposite of the truth. What he thought was that the statesman's gift consisted in insight into the facts of a particular era, disclosing the existence of material for forming public opinion and directing public opinion to a given purpose. In every one of his achievements of high mark—even in his last marked failure of achievement—he expressly formed, or endeavoured to form and create, the public opinion upon which he knew that in the last resort he must depend.

'We have seen the triumph of 1853. Did he, in renewing the most hated of taxes, run about anxiously feeling the pulse of public opinion? On the contrary, he grappled with the facts with infinite labour—and half his genius was labour; he built up a great plan; he carried it to the Cabinet; they warned him that the House of Commons would be against him; the officials of the Treasury told him the Bank would be against him; that a strong press of commercial interests would be against him. Like the bold and sinewy athlete that he always was, he stood to his plan; he carried the Cabinet; he persuaded the House of Commons; he vanquished the Bank and the hostile interests; and, in the words of Sir Stafford Northcote, he changed and turned, for many years to come, a current of public opinion that seemed far too powerful for any minister to resist. In the tempestuous discussions during the seventies on the policy of this country in respect of the Christian races of the Balkan Peninsula, he with his own voice created, moulded, inspired, and kindled with resistless flame the whole of the public opinion that eventually guided the policy of the nation, with such admirable effect both for its own fame and for the good of the world. Take again the Land Act of 1881, in some ways the most deep-reaching of all his legislative achievements. Here he had no flowing tide; every current was against him. He carried his scheme against the ignorance of the country, against the prejudice of the country, and against the standing prejudices of both branches of the legislature, who were steeped from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot in the strictest doctrines of contract.

'Then his passion for economy, his ceaseless war against public profusion, his insistence upon rigorous keeping of the national accounts—in this great department of affairs he led and did not follow. In no sphere of his activities was he more strenuous, and in no sphere, as he must well have known, was he less likely to win popularity. For democracy is spendthrift; if, to be sure, we may not say that most forms of government are apt to be the same' (iii, 536-7).

On Gladstone's passion for economy we shall have something to say presently. Here we revert to the consideration of his more general characteristics. Apart altogether from politics, he was a deeply-read theologian, albeit of a rather belated type; an ecclesiastical thinker of large outlook, though curiously out of touch with the movement of the modern world; a ripe scholar, though no scientific humanist; an ardent lover of letters, who had formed his taste on Homer and Dante, and who, though he read vastly, seldom read without purpose and profit. He was also a vigorous and versatile writer on many topics, as none know better than the conductors of this Review.* Though his occasional writings were of very unequal power and felicity, yet they occasionally rise almost to the level of his own consummate oratory. Withal he was a most painstaking, indefatigable, and intrepid man of business, as is shown by the story, hitherto known to few, which is told by Mr Morley in his chapter on the Hawarden estate.

In connexion with this subject, it must suffice to say that he found the estate deeply and almost hopelessly encumbered by hazardous and unsuccessful mining and manufacturing operations affecting an outlying portion of it in Staffordshire. The whole estate was in consequence burdened with a charge of 250,000*l.*, leaving its beneficial owner, Sir Stephen Glynne, with no margin to live upon. Mr Gladstone was, by the terms of his marriage settlement, implicated in the catastrophe, and for five years at least he 'threw himself with the whole weight of his

* Mr Morley refers to some of his political contributions to the Quarterly Review made at a time when his political views were in sympathy with ours; but he was a not infrequent contributor of articles, non-political in character, at a later period in his career. Some of these were reprinted in his 'Gleanings.' They are not without biographical value as showing the bent of his mind and thought.

untiring energy and force into this far-spreading entanglement.' The Hawarden estate was cleared in the end, but not without great sacrifices, nor without his pledging his own fortune on it to the extent of no less than 267,000*l*. Yet of all this immense labour and sustained personal sacrifice the world at large has scarcely heard a word. Let us add that his private charities and benefactions, known only to himself, amounted to upwards of 70,000*l*. between 1831 and 1890, and that before his death a sum of over 13,000*l*. more was added to the total; and, to complete the chapter of Mr Gladstone's dealings with his own conscience out of the sight of men and even in defiance of all worldly opinion, let us quote Mr Morley's account of the life-long mission of mercy which has so often been used to sully his personal repute in the loose and irresponsible gossip of the town.

'On his first entry upon the field of responsible life, he had formed a serious and solemn engagement with a friend—I suppose it was Hope-Scott—that each would devote himself to active service in some branch of religious work. He could not, without treason to his gifts, go forth like Selwyn or Patteson to Melanesia to convert the savages. He sought a missionary field at home, and he found it among the unfortunate ministers to "the great sin of great cities." In these humane efforts at reclamation he persevered all through his life, fearless of misconstruction, fearless of the levity or baseness of men's tongues, regardless almost of the possible mischiefs to the public policies that depended on him. Greville tells the story how, in 1853, a man made an attempt one night to extort money from Mr Gladstone, then in office as Chancellor of the Exchequer, by threats of exposure; and how he instantly gave the offender into custody, and met the case at the police office. Greville could not complete the story. The man was committed for trial. Mr Gladstone directed his solicitors to see that the accused was properly defended. He was convicted and sent to prison. By and by Mr Gladstone inquired from the governor of the prison how the delinquent was conducting himself. The report being satisfactory, he next wrote to Lord Palmerston, then at the Home Office, asking that the prisoner should be let out. There was no worldly wisdom in it, we all know. But then what are people Christians for?' (iii, 419).

These are some leading features of Mr Gladstone's personal character and private life, apart from his career

as a public man. There are in this portrait, at any rate, no dark or doubtful lineaments; and, did space permit, we could quote passage after passage to heighten the picture of his laborious, high-minded, and conscientious persistence in the profitable use of rare and high gifts, and in the scrupulous discharge of all the duties imposed on him by life and its circumstances. Nevertheless, it was a pre-established harmony between his best gifts and the proper field for their employment that made him a politician. He might have been anything, as Huxley said. But unless he had followed his early and rather *schwärmerisch* impulse to take orders, it is certain that in any civil walk of life he must have gravitated sooner or later to politics. He was essentially a man of action, although he was a great deal more, and had several qualities, gifts, and even failings which are seldom found so highly developed in men of action of the class to which he belonged. Mr Morley puts all this very well in his opening pages.

'It is true that what interests the world in Mr Gladstone is even more what he was than what he did; his brilliancy, charm, and power; the endless surprises; his dualism or more than dualism; his vicissitudes of opinion; his subtleties of mental progress; his strange union of qualities never elsewhere found together; his striking unlikeness to other men in whom great and free nations have for long periods placed their trust. . . . Some may think in this connection that I have made the preponderance of politics excessive in the story of a genius of signal versatility, to whom politics were only one interest among many. . . . Yet, after all, it was to his thoughts, his purposes, his ideals, his performances as statesman, in all the widest significance of that lofty and honourable designation, that Mr Gladstone owes the lasting substance of his fame. His life was ever "*greatly absorbed*," he said, "*in working the institutions of his country*." Here we mark a signal trait. Not for two centuries, since the historic strife of Anglican and Puritan, had our island produced a ruler in whom the religious motive was paramount in the like degree. He was not only a political force but a moral force. He strove to use all the powers of his own genius and the powers of the state for moral purposes and religious. Nevertheless, his mission in all its forms was action. He had none of that detachment, often found among superior minds, which we honour for its disinterestedness, even while we lament its

impotence in result. The track in which he moved, the instruments that he employed, were the track and the instruments, the sword and the trowel, of political action; and what is called the Gladstonian era was distinctively a political era' (i, 2, 3).

Moreover, he was a great orator; and oratory in these days is more potent in the senate and the market-place than it is even in the pulpit. As an orator he was, at least in some respects, unequalled by any contemporary. Bright had greater majesty, perhaps; his language was more nervous and concise; but his range was far narrower. His was the eloquence of the set speech, elaborately prepared and often for the most part carefully written down. The famous 'angel of death' passage was a flight beyond the power even of Mr Gladstone's wings. Mr Gladstone, on the other hand, was often at his best when most unprepared. He was often nervous (he told a friend) when opening a debate, never in reply. His playful improvisations, when he drew upon the genial stores of his memory to enliven a passing issue or merely to show how charming he could be when he chose, were inimitable. Equally unrivalled was his command of all the resources of lucid exposition, of serious and purposeful pleading, of lofty and impassioned appeal.

But in truth the secret of Mr Gladstone's eloquence is that it was essentially the oratory of the spoken word. Few, if any, of his speeches will ever be read by posterity as we still read the speeches of Demosthenes or of Cicero, of Burke or of Sheridan, of Macaulay or even of Bright. But if oratory be persuasion, the instant and incessant interchange of sympathy between a speaker and his audience, the magic swaying of a multitude or the irresistible enchantment of a senate, then assuredly was Mr Gladstone one of the greatest of orators. No one who has not seen and heard the great enchanter at work can now form the slightest idea how enthralling were his spells. It was a dangerous gift, and was often used, as many thought and think, to make the worse appear the better reason. But, even if we put aside altogether every question and occasion about which controversy still rages, there remains in the memory and the records of those who heard him, a large residue of truly noble rhetoric, of lucid and fascinating exposition, of stirring encourage-

ment to the pursuit of great enterprises and high ideals, such as few orators have rivalled, and still fewer surpassed. But the orator, like the actor, lives only in the recollection of those who heard and saw him—for seeing in both cases is quite as important as hearing; nor is any man a great orator who has not many of the gifts of a great actor—his command of gesture, his variety and grace of elocution, his mobility of feature, his instant sympathy with the ethical tone of this or that situation, his power of evoking that sympathy in every member of his audience; and this is surely what Demosthenes meant by making *ὑπόκρισις*—acting, not action—the secret of all oratory. In this sense Mr Gladstone was every inch an actor. But all this is essentially evanescent. The living orator departs; nothing but a pale *simulacrum* survives in the written word. Yet the memory of those who saw and heard him in the flesh can still bring back to us something of the vanished soul and spirit. And since Mr Bryce and Mr Morley both enjoyed that privilege, and both select Mr Gladstone's speech on the Affirmation Bill as one of the most impressive of his later efforts, both describing it in very similar language, we will take Mr Morley's account of it as a typical illustration of that kind of oratory in which Mr Gladstone was supreme.

‘The speech proved one of his greatest. Imposing, lofty, persuasive, sage, it would have been, from whatever lips it might have fallen; it was signal indeed as coming from one so fervid, so definite, so unfaltering in a faith of his own, one who had started from the opposite pole to that great civil principle of which he now displayed a grasp invincible. . . . These high themes of faith, on the one hand, and freedom on the other, exactly fitted the range of the thoughts in which Mr Gladstone habitually lived. . . . I wonder, too, if there has been a leader in Parliament since the seventeenth century, who could venture to address it in the strain of the memorable passage now to be transcribed:—

“You draw your line at the point where the abstract denial of God is severed from the abstract admission of the Deity. My proposition is that the line thus drawn is worthless, and that much on your side of the line is as objectionable as the atheism on the other. If you call upon us to make distinctions, let them at least be rational; I do not say let them be Christian distinctions, but let them be rational. I can understand one rational distinction, that you should

frame the oath in such a way as to recognise not only the existence of the Deity, but the providence of the Deity, and man's responsibility to the Deity; and in such a way as to indicate the knowledge in a man's own mind that he must answer to the Deity for what he does, and is able to do. . . . Many of the members of this House will recollect the majestic and noble lines—

Omnis enim per se divom natura necesse est
Immortali aevo summa cum pace fruatur,
Semota a nostris rebus sejunctaque longe.
Nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,
Ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,
Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira.

“Divinity exists—according to these, I must say, magnificent lines—in remote and inaccessible recesses; but with us it has no dealing, of us it has no need, with us it has no relation! I do not hesitate to say that the specific evil, the specific form of irreligion, with which, in the educated society of this country, you have to contend, and with respect to which you ought to be on your guard, is not blank atheism. That is a rare opinion, very rarely met with; but what is frequently met with is that form of opinion which would teach us that, whatever may be beyond the visible things of this world, whatever there may be beyond this short span of life, you know and you can know nothing of it, and that it is a bootless undertaking to attempt to establish relations with it. That is the mischief of the age, and that mischief you do not attempt to touch.”

“The House, though but few perhaps recollected their Lucretius, or had ever even read him, sat, as I well remember, with reverential stillness, hearkening, from this born master of moving cadence and high sustained modulation, to “the rise and long roll of the hexameter”—to the plangent lines that have come down across the night of time to us from great Rome’ (iii, 18–20).

We cannot attempt to discuss all the elements of Mr Gladstone's extraordinary personality, nor can we consider all the debatable points in his long and extraordinary career. We are not concerned to raise controversial issues, except so far as they invite discussion of a strictly historical nature in the light of facts hitherto unknown or of circumstances hitherto unconsidered. Our own opinions on many of the questions raised by Mr Gladstone's career

are well known, and they remain unaltered. But candour requires us to do justice to Mr Morley's defence of policies which are still odious to us, and of acts of Mr Gladstone's which, however well intentioned, we still regard as misguided and impolitic.

Want of space forbids us to discuss those distracted wanderings of Mr Gladstone in search of a party in the fifties, in the tracing of which Mr Morley himself, with all his lucidity and candour, sometimes seems almost to lose the thread. That is a history in itself; and, like all histories of the breaking up and remaking of parties, it is a bewildering story of currents and counter-currents, of personal affinities and animosities, of conflicting impulses and aspirations, a very maze of political casuistry and confusion through which the supersensitive conscience of Mr Gladstone and his supersubtle intellect were certain to take him by paths which seemed tortuous and were assuredly hard to follow. We know not whether Mr Gladstone's own apology for his political changes, uttered in conversation with Mr Morley in 1891, may be taken to cover this period of his career; but, if so, it is rather a scanty garment.

'I think I can truly put all the change that has come into my politics into a sentence. I was brought up to distrust and dislike liberty; I learned to believe in it. That is the key to all my changes.'

To pass over this period of Mr Gladstone's life also involves the exclusion of the Crimean War and Mr Gladstone's share in it, though no one who seeks to understand Mr Gladstone thoroughly can afford to neglect this episode in his career. But we must not attempt to enumerate all our exclusions, lest the fascination of the subject should beguile us into the discussion of the excluded topics one by one.

Most persons would say that Mr Gladstone's triumphs, or, at any rate, the least questionable of them, were achieved in the domain of finance. We do not dispute this judgment, so far as constructive policy is concerned, nor yet in regard to the boldness of his measures and his unrivalled felicity in expounding them. Yet it is no paradox to say, as Mr Morley says in speaking of his first budget, that he was a financier almost by accident.

It was by no choice of his own that he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in the government of Lord Aberdeen; and it was even against his own inclination that he became Vice-President of the Board of Trade when he joined Peel's government in 1841. When Peel offered him this post, he said: 'It is right that I should say, as strongly as I can, that I am not fit for it. I have no general knowledge of trade.' He regarded with an equal sense of his unfitness any post connected with the services; but he records later that 'the idea of the Irish secretaryship had nestled in my mind.' Peel had entertained that idea too, but he had rejected it in deference to 'some considerations connected with the Presbyterians of Ireland'; and so Mr Gladstone went, not very willingly, to the Board of Trade. 'In a spirit of ignorant mortification, I said to myself at the moment, the science of politics deals with the government of men, but I am set to govern packages.' But it was there that he learnt to govern men, or at least to understand and handle some of the most potent springs of their activity; and the knowledge he acquired at the Board of Trade was perfected and sharpened by his five years' immersion in the affairs of the Hawarden estate. It is, by the way, an early illustration of administrative inefficiency in this country that, when Mr Gladstone advanced his ignorance of trade as a disqualification, Peel replied: 'I think you will find Lord Ripon a perfect master of these subjects.' Lord Ripon, it will be remembered, was Disraeli's transient and embarrassed phantom.' What Mr Gladstone actually did find was that 'in a very short time I came to form a low estimate of the knowledge and information of Lord Ripon.' He also found quickly enough that a knowledge of trade was no bad equipment for the government of men. Mr Morley shall tell the story and point the moral.

'It was upon Mr Gladstone that the burden of the immense achievement of the new tariff fell; and the toil was huge. He used afterwards to say that he had been concerned in four revisions of the tariff, in 1842, 1845, 1853, and 1860, and that the first of them cost six times as much trouble as the other three put together. He spoke one hundred and twenty-nine times during the session. He had only once sat on a committee of trade, and had only once spoken on a purely trade

question during the nine years of his parliamentary life. All his habits of thought and action had been cast in a different mould. It is ordinarily assumed that he was a born financier, endowed besides with a gift of idealism and the fine training of a scholar. As a matter of fact, it was the other way; he was a man of high practical and moral imagination, with an understanding made accurate by strength of grasp and incomparable power of rapid and concentrated apprehension, yoked to finance only by force of circumstance—a man who would have made a shining and effective figure in whatever path of great public affairs, whether ecclesiastical or secular, duty might have called for his exertions' (i, 255).

'In whatever path of great public affairs duty might call for his exertions.' Another path of public affairs in which, for a short and troubled period, duty did call for his exertions, was the Colonial Office. Did he there show himself a 'Little Englander'? His tenure of office was short, and he had no seat in Parliament at the time; but his views on colonial policy were recorded in 1855, at a time when he had not long ceased to be a colleague of Sir William Molesworth—that sturdy Imperialist before his time.

'Govern them upon a principle of freedom. Defend them against aggression from without. Regulate their foreign relations. These things belong to the colonial connection. But of the duration of that connection let them be the judges, and I predict that, if you leave them the freedom of judgment, it is hard to say when the day will come when they will wish to separate from the great name of England. Depend upon it, they covet a share in that great name. You will find in that feeling of theirs the greatest security for the connection. Make the name of England yet more and more an object of desire to the Colonies. Their natural disposition is to love and revere the name of England, and this reverence is by far the best security you can have for their continuing, not only to be subjects of the Crown, not only to render it allegiance, but to render it that allegiance which is the most precious of all—the allegiance which proceeds from the depths of the heart of man. You have seen various colonies, some of them lying at the antipodes, offering to you their contributions to assist in supporting the wives and families of your soldiers, the heroes that have fallen in the war. This, I venture to say, may be said, without exaggeration, to be among the first fruits of that system upon which, within the last twelve

or fifteen years, you have founded a rational mode of administering the affairs of your Colonies without gratuitous interference' (i, 363-4).

He was never at the Foreign Office; and perhaps most people would say that it was well for the country and the empire that he was not. We shall not gainsay the judgment, though it might well be argued that an early initiation into the *arcana* of continental politics, such as experience at the Foreign Office would have given a man of his commanding aptitude for affairs, might have saved him from some of the worst of those miscarriages of foreign policy which so often seemed to dog his governments like a spectre. Lord Granville was his Foreign Secretary until he was succeeded by Lord Rosebery; and Lord Granville was not a strong man, nor had he the untiring industry of his chief. But Mr Gladstone held, as Peel had held, and as Grey had held before him, though Melbourne had weakened the salutary tradition, that the conduct of foreign affairs belongs almost as much to the Prime Minister as it does to the Foreign Secretary himself. For this reason the foreign policy of his several governments belongs to his biographical record, and must submit to be judged by the impartial tribunal of history. What verdict will it render?

We are still too near his time for a final judgment on all points, but this, perhaps, may even now be said, without provoking serious dispute, that, in spite of Majuba, on which we have said all that needs to be said here, and in spite of Khartoum, on which we shall have something to say presently, in spite of the vacillations and blunders of his policy in Egypt, in spite of the disrepute into which his general scheme of foreign policy has fallen, Mr Gladstone must be credited with two notable achievements, of which the full and final consequences are not even yet exhausted. He restored the European Concert, which had been shattered by the Cyprus Convention; and by its agency, in the teeth of innumerable difficulties and obstacles, without breach of the peace, and without open rupture of the Concert—though some of its performers only stayed in the orchestra on the understanding that they were not to play the tune—he brought the present Sultan to his knees. He is, perhaps, the only statesman in Europe who has ever done this; and at this juncture it is

worth while to remember how he did it. Again, by means of the Washington Treaty and the Geneva Arbitration, he settled the Alabama dispute, and thereby removed the most serious obstacle to a close and cordial understanding between this country and the United States. It was a great thing to do; and it was not done without loss of credit at the time. No great things ever are done in this world unless men are prepared to make some politic surrender of pride, temper, it may be of dignity, though never of honour, for the sake of doing them.

'It is,' as Mr Morley says in another connexion, 'one of the commonest of all secrets of cheap misjudgment in human affairs, to start by assuming that there is always some good way out of a bad case.'

It must be acknowledged, on the other hand, that Mr Gladstone made one great mistake in his treatment of American affairs—a mistake seldom censured, however, by those who were hardest on his foreign policy in general—when he declared at Newcastle in 1862 that Jefferson Davis and the other leaders of the South had 'made a nation.' It was a gratuitous mistake and a grievous one—gratuitous, because it was no part of his business as a subordinate minister to touch upon questions of the utmost delicacy; and grievous, because a single word uttered at that juncture, apparently with the authority of the government, might have caused the quivering balance of public opinion in this country to incline towards an awful catastrophe. 'It is, however,' as Mr Morley says and shows, 'superfluous for any of us at this day to pass judgment.' Mr Gladstone has passed judgment on himself. In a fragmentary note, written so late as 1896, he frankly acknowledges his error, and atones for it by the fullness of his acknowledgment.

'I have yet to record an undoubted error, the most singular and palpable, I may add the least excusable of them all, especially since it was committed so late as in the year 1862, when I had outlived half a century. . . . I declared in the heat of the American struggle that Jefferson Davis had made a nation, that is to say, that the division of the American Republic by the establishment of a Southern or secession state was an accomplished fact. Strange to say, this declaration, most unwarrantable to be made by a Minister of the Crown,

with no authority other than his own, was not due to any feeling of partisanship for the South or hostility to the North. The fortunes of the South were at their zenith. Many who wished well to the Northern cause despaired of its success. The friends of the North in England were beginning to advise that it should give way, for the avoidance of further bloodshed and greater calamity. I weakly supposed that the time had come when respectful suggestions of this kind, founded on the necessity of the case, were required by a spirit of that friendship which, in so many contingencies of life, has to offer sound recommendations with a knowledge that they will not be popular. Not only was this a misjudgment of the case, but, even if it had been otherwise, I was not the person to make the declaration. I really, though most strangely, believed that it was an act of friendliness to all America to recognise that the struggle was virtually at an end. I was not one of those who, on the ground of British interests, desired a division of the American Union. My view was distinctly opposite. I thought that, while the Union continued, it never could exercise any dangerous pressure upon Canada to estrange it from the empire—our honour, as I thought, rather than our interest, forbidding its surrender. But were the Union split, the North, no longer checked by the jealousies of slave power, would seek a partial compensation for its loss in annexing, or trying to annex, British North America. Lord Palmerston desired the severance as a diminution of a dangerous power, but prudently held his tongue.

‘That my opinion was founded on a false estimate of the facts was the very least part of my fault. I did not perceive the gross impropriety of such an utterance from a Cabinet Minister of a power allied in blood and language, and bound to loyal neutrality; the case being further exaggerated by the fact that we were already, so to speak, under indictment before the world for not (as was alleged) having strictly enforced the laws of neutrality in the matter of the cruisers. My offence was indeed only a mistake, but one of incredible grossness, and with such consequences of offence and alarm attached to it, that my failing to perceive them justly exposed me to very severe blame. It illustrates vividly that incapacity which my mind so long retained, and perhaps still exhibits, an incapacity of viewing subjects all round, in their extraneous as well as in their internal properties, and thereby of knowing when to be silent and when to speak’ (ii, 81-2).

The really great blots on Mr Gladstone's foreign policy have always been held to be the muddle in Egypt

and the tragedy of Khartoum. How do they appear now in the light of what Mr Morley has to say and to tell? 'Extenuating circumstances' is probably the nearest approach to a verdict of acquittal that even Mr Morley would claim; and it is more than doubtful whether even that plea will be accepted now by any who did not adopt it at the time. It is true, no doubt, that the Egyptian question was one of the most difficult that an English ministry has ever had to handle; that there were many divergent views in the Cabinet—we know that Bright resigned when Alexandria was bombarded—and that vacillation of policy, distraction in counsel, and incoherence in action, were certain in that case to ensue. One thing is clear, however. The muddle in Egypt was assuredly no result, as was often alleged at the time, of Mr Gladstone's imperious will, combined with what his critics held to be his native incapacity for the handling of foreign affairs. It is probable that there would have been far less muddle if Mr Gladstone's will had been more imperious than it was.

'In common talk and in partisan speeches,' says Mr Morley, 'the Prime Minister was regarded as dictatorial and imperious. The complaint of some, at least, among his colleagues in the Cabinet of 1880 was rather that he was not imperious enough. Almost from the first, he too frequently allowed himself to be overruled; often in secondary matters, it is true, but sometimes also in matters on the uncertain frontier between secondary and primary. Then he adopted a practice of taking votes and counting numbers, of which more than one old hand complained as an innovation. Lord Granville said to him in 1886, "I think you too often counted noses in your last Cabinet"' (iii, 5).

Sir William Harcourt told the House of Commons the same thing at the time of his death:—

'I have heard men who knew him not at all, who have asserted that the supremacy of his genius and the weight of his authority oppressed and overbore those who lived with him and those who worked under him. Nothing could be more untrue. Of all chiefs he was the least exacting.'

Nevertheless, a Prime Minister is, after all, a Prime Minister. If he chooses to count noses and to defer to the shifting opinions of colleagues less wise than himself,

he must bear the blame of the distracted counsels that are sure to ensue.

Very much the same thing must be said of the tragedy of Khartoum. But here, by a curious irony of fate and circumstance, Mr Gladstone was more than once disabled by indisposition at critical moments, and thereby debarred from making his will prevail, even if he had wished to do so. The expedition of Hicks Pasha should have been forbidden. This was the root of all the evil; and there is no reason to suppose that Mr Gladstone was not a fully consenting party to this 'capital miscalculation,' as Mr Morley frankly calls it. The Cabinet ought to have seen that a door must be open or shut; and the flimsy plea that they could not shatter the Egyptian government will impose on no one now, though in Mr Gladstone's dexterous hands it did good apologetic work at the time. The next step in the fatal business was the sending of troops to Suakin; and here Mr Gladstone stood alone in his Cabinet in objecting to it. When this led to miscarriage and defeat, the cry arose that Gordon should be sent out. There were hesitations in many quarters, as well there might be; but the country was getting into what Mr Morley calls 'one of its high idealising humours.' Gordon was accordingly despatched in a highly dramatic, we had almost said in a melodramatic, fashion, Mr Gladstone, who was at Hawarden, consenting, but taking no personal part in the hasty consultations which led to his mission. So it fell out that the most romantic adventure in modern English politics was directly initiated by Lord Hartington, the least romantic of modern English statesmen.

'Gordon's policies,' says Mr Morley, 'were many and very mutable.' His original instructions were practically drafted by himself, and he repudiated them almost before the ink was dry upon them. Of this there is no doubt whatever, though Mr Morley's generous apology is valid.

'Viewing the frightful embarrassments that enveloped him, we cannot wonder. Still,' he adds, 'the same considerateness that is always so bounteously and so justly extended to the soldier in the field, is no less due in its measure to the councillor in the Cabinet. This is a bit of equity often much neglected both by contemporaries and by history' (iii, 155).

We need not enumerate all the several policies succes-

sively recommended by Gordon as alternatives to his original instructions. His recall was more than once debated by the Cabinet; and matters finally came to an issue over his proposal that Zobeir Pasha, a slave-dealer and partisan leader, whose son Gordon had caused to be shot, should be appointed his successor as Governor-general of the Soudan, and entrusted with the task of withdrawing the outlying Egyptian garrisons. It was a startling proposal, though Zobeir was known to be a man of great military capacity and great personal ascendancy. Mr Gladstone was for accepting it; and so too was the Queen. But the Cabinet would have none of it, feeling convinced that the House of Commons would veto it. Mr Gladstone was again confined to his room, though the Cabinet met in his house. 'One of the ministers went to see him in his bed, and they conversed for two hours. The minister, on his return, reported, with some ironic amusement, that Mr Gladstone considered it very likely that they could not bring Parliament to swallow Zobeir, but believed that he himself could.' At one time it seemed as if Zobeir would be sent by the casting vote of the Prime Minister. But two of his colleagues receded from their ground, and he gave way—nothing of the imperious will here at any rate. Thenceforward the catastrophe was inevitable. It was certain that Gordon would not carry out the purposes entrusted to him by the Cabinet if he could, and could not if he would. As he could no longer be recalled, public opinion, 'now in one of its high idealising humours,' would insist on his not being repudiated or abandoned. A relief expedition became necessary; and for the fatal delays which stamped 'too late' on its enterprises the military authorities seem to have been not less responsible than the politicians. The tragedy was played out to its bitter end. Mr Gladstone himself composed its sorry epilogue. In 1890 he wrote:—

'Jan. 10, 1890.—In the Gordon case we all, and I rather prominently, must continue to suffer in silence. Gordon was a hero, and a hero of heroes; but we ought to have known that a hero of heroes is not the proper person to give effect at a distant point, and in most difficult circumstances, to the views of ordinary men. It was unfortunate that he should claim the hero's privilege by turning upside down and inside out every idea and intention with which he had left England,

and for which he had obtained our approval. Had my views about Zobeir prevailed, it would not have removed our difficulties, as Forster would certainly have moved and, with the Tories and the Irish, have carried a condemnatory address. My own opinion is that it is harder to justify our doing so much to rescue him, than our not doing more. Had the party reached Khartoum in time, he would not have come away (as I suppose), and the dilemma would have arisen in another form' (iii, 168-9).

Extenuating circumstances there were, no doubt; there always are. But statesmanship is a higher art than that of keeping the peace within a Cabinet; and we cannot forget that evening visit to the theatre.

Mr Gladstone never held a post in the department of either of the services. Here, again, we may say with confidence that it would have been better for his own fame, and for the welfare of his country, if he had. He never understood the problem of defence, least of all that of naval defence; and he seemed to think it quite natural that the Admiralty should be required to cut its coat according to the cloth served out to it by the Treasury. His passion for economy he had inherited from Peel. But Peel, though a rigid economist, was much more in touch with the services, and much more keen for their efficiency than Mr Gladstone ever was. Peel had Wellington for colleague and mentor; he was vigilant in keeping the departments up to the mark; and in writing to Wellington in 1844 he laid down the unimpeachable principle that 'whatever be the state of our finances, it will be true economy as well as true policy not to leave certain vital interests unprotected.' Very different was Mr Gladstone's method. Economy with him was an end in itself. To security he never seems to have given a thought. He was accidentally right in resisting Palmerston's craze for fortifications, because that was founded on a radically vicious theory of defence. But he resisted it on abstract and quite irrelevant grounds of economy, not by opposing a sound theory of defence to an unsound one; and he would have done just the same had Palmerston proposed an equivalent expenditure on mobile naval force. He sent Mr Childers to the Admiralty with a mandate to cut down the estimates, and he armed him with an Order in Council which dislodged the sea-lords from the

position they occupied under the Admiralty patent, and made the First Lord supreme. This Order in Council still survives side by side with the patent; but the incompatibility of the two instruments, the larger prescriptive authority of the older one, the spirit of Admiralty administration, the native capacity of naval officers to get the best work out of tools not of the best, and, above all, the wise policy pursued by successive First Lords, more especially by Lord Spencer, Lord Goschen, and Lord Selborne, have all combined to make it of little or no effect. It must be said too, in justice to Mr Childers, that the reforms and reductions effected by him did not, as is clearly shown in his biography, impair the effective of the Fleet as measured by the standards of those days.

But if retrenchment could have been had in no other way, Mr Gladstone's whole attitude towards the problem of defence must be taken as proof that he would have insisted on getting it in that way. Every one knows the story of Lord Palmerston's drawer full of Mr Gladstone's resignations on the score of expenditure. In a letter written to his wife in 1865, he records how he has had 'no effective or broad support' in the Cabinet in his opposition to the navy estimates, and how the estimates are 'always settled at the dagger's point.' It was a conflict over the estimates which brought about the dissolution of 1874. Again, Mr Morley states plainly, what has long been suspected by many, that the time and occasion of his final resignation in 1894 were really determined, not by the considerations, sufficient in themselves but not imperative at the moment, which alone could be avowed at the time, but by his insuperable objection to the navy estimates proposed by Lord Spencer, and accepted by a majority of his colleagues. In this, at any rate, he was consistent—fatally consistent—to the last. 'What would be said,' he asked, 'of my active participation in a policy that will be taken as plunging England into the whirlpool of militarism.' Nothing would be said, we suppose, of his life-long pursuit of a policy which might have plunged England unprepared into a naval conflict fraught with overwhelming ruin. The state of his eyesight was alleged at the time as the main cause of his resignation. It was not the cataract in his bodily eye, however, but the still darker obsession of his mental vision, which never allowed

him to see that saving without security is the worst form of national extravagance. His life-long attitude towards this subject was a negation of Adam Smith's pregnant saying, 'Defence is of much more importance than opulence.'

It remains to consider some of the more questionable of Mr Gladstone's political enterprises and actions in the light that Mr Morley has to throw upon them. It is inevitable that, in dealing with still living and disputed issues, a biographer should be more or less of an advocate. All we can expect of him, if he shares the opinions and has followed the lead of his subject, is a presentation of historical and biographical fact as impartial and dispassionate as is consistent with those feelings of sympathy and respect which he naturally entertains for his former leader.

We have no space to waste on the two 'stubborn and noisy scuffles,' as Mr Morley calls them, known at the time as the Collier and Ewelme scandals, which contributed materially to Mr Gladstone's personal disrepute and the discredit of his government in the latter days of his first administration. Beyond dispute they were, both of them, ill-advised proceedings; and a more astute man of the world than Mr Gladstone ever was would have known that they were certain to provoke criticism altogether out of proportion to the importance of the issues involved. It is never wise to do things which require some casuistry to defend, even though the motives may be unimpeachable, and though the thing itself may, on its merits, and apart from technicalities, be the right thing to be done. The Collier appointment was, it appears, approved by the Cabinet and sanctioned by the high authority, legal and moral, of Lord Hatherley and Roundell Palmer. The Ewelme Rectory appointment was more exclusively Mr Gladstone's own doing. We agree with Mr Morley in thinking the thing had better not have been done. But it was a storm in a tea-cup at the worst; and what administration has ever existed, down to the present day, which can afford to throw stones on the score of jobs?

A more serious question arises as to the sudden dissolution of 1874. It has been alleged on high authority—that of two of Mr Gladstone's own colleagues—that the time of this dissolution, which certainly took every one by surprise, was determined by no reasons of policy but

mainly, if not solely, by the difficulty in which Mr Gladstone found himself, owing to his having assumed the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer in addition to that of First Lord of the Treasury. It seemed impossible to ascertain whether this act had vacated his seat for Greenwich or not. The Speaker, the law officers of the Crown, and other high legal authorities, were consulted and gave either contradictory opinions or none at all. Lord Selborne, who thought that the seat had been vacated, also thought in after years—it seems doubtful whether he held the same opinion at the time—that there was no way out of the difficulty except through the door of a dissolution. It seems natural, therefore, that he should record in his 'Memorials' that this difficulty was the determining cause of the dissolution when it came so suddenly. But Lord Halifax, a man of sound sense and great experience of public affairs, had pointed out to Mr Gladstone how the parliamentary difficulty ought to be met. Mr Childers, who had been disappointed in not being made Chancellor of the Exchequer when Mr Lowe resigned and Mr Gladstone took his office, also held that the double office and its unsolved problems were the main cause of the dissolution. 'But his surmise,' as Mr Morley says, 'was not quite impartial.' The opinion of Lord Selborne and Mr Childers seems now to have been very commonly accepted.

'I can only say,' Mr Morley comments, 'that in the mass of papers connected with the Greenwich seat and the dissolution, there is no single word in one of them associating in any way either topic with the other. Mr Gladstone acted so promptly in the affair of the seat that both the Speaker of the House of Commons and Lord Selborne himself said that no fault could be found with him. His position before the House was therefore entirely straightforward. Finally, Mr Gladstone gave an obviously adequate and sufficient case for the dissolution both to the Queen and to the Cabinet, and stated to at least three of his colleagues what was "the determining cause"; and this was not the Greenwich seat, but something wholly remote from it' (ii, 471-2).

We have seen that the proposed repeal of the income-tax was alleged by many critics to have been a mere bribe to an estranged electorate, improvised to cover the

Prime Minister's retreat. We have also seen that this charitable allegation is devoid of foundation. Mr Gladstone began to think of measures for the repeal of the income-tax almost as soon as he became Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was indeed this plan, fully conceived in his own mind, but not yet sanctioned by his colleagues, that was the real cause of the dissolution, not its equivocal consequence. The plan involved certain economies; and this brought the Prime Minister into direct conflict—a too frequent episode in his career—with his two colleagues at the head of what he was fond of calling 'the great spending departments.' Both declined to give way, but both consented to review their position should a general election be found to approve the policy put before the country by Mr Gladstone. This was known at the time only to Lord Granville, Mr Cardwell, and Mr Goschen—the three ministers mentioned above by Mr Morley. The statement made to the Queen and to the Cabinet was couched in more general terms, and the difficulty about the estimates was not specifically mentioned. There may have been bad policy in all this, but there was no bad faith or base motive in it.

Lastly, we have to consider, very briefly, Mr Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule. We shall not be suspected of defending the policy in trying to ascertain Mr Gladstone's real motives, and, where necessary, to do justice to them. Unless he was a hypocrite to his own diary and to his own familiar friends, it is quite certain that his desire gradually to withdraw from public life when he withdrew from the leadership of the Liberal party in 1874 was entirely sincere. It is equally certain that his public conscience, as he understood its promptings, and nothing else, compelled him to suppress that desire when the Eastern Question became acute between 1877 and 1880, and to do his utmost to restrain his country from committing what he regarded, rightly or wrongly, as a great act of treason to freedom, humanity, and Christianity. This brings us to 1880, and to the government of that year, which lasted until 1885. Again, Mr Gladstone, unless he was a consummate hypocrite, would gladly have quitted public life if his sense of public duty had permitted him to follow his own bent. But the Irish question had now become acute. The Irish peasant had been enfranchised; and a large

access of strength to the Nationalist party in Parliament was known to be inevitable. The Conservative government had abandoned coercion; Lord Salisbury had permitted his Lord-Lieutenant to confer with the Nationalist leader—of course without prejudice—and had made a speech at Newport which was regarded by many as indicating, to say the least, a 'coming-on disposition.' A general election followed, which gave the Conservatives no majority, even with the Irish vote, and the Liberals no majority without it. Did Mr Gladstone then, for the first time, intimate that the Irish question must be faced in all its magnitude, and that even the demand for Home Rule, now constitutionally expressed, must be considered in all seriousness? Assuredly not. He had intimated so much in his election address, and he had allowed Mr Childers at Pontefract to put similar ideas into much plainer language than he thought it politic to use himself—to propound, in fact, what Mr Morley calls 'a tolerably full-fledged scheme of Home Rule.' Moreover, before declaring himself definitely, he had made overtures to Lord Salisbury with a view to such a settlement of the Irish question, by consent of both parties, and under the auspices of the Conservative leader, as might be acceptable to the Imperial Parliament, without being wholly unacceptable to Parnell and his followers. These overtures were rejected. It was only then that, very slowly and reluctantly, and not without many conferences with his leading colleagues, he came to the conclusion that he must attempt to deal with the question himself, and deal with it by the way of party conflict instead of by the way of party co-operation, which had been closed to him. However strongly we may condemn the policy which he then adopted, we cannot resist Mr Morley's contention that, if wrong, he was not basely wrong. On this point, at any rate, there seems to be no appeal from the declaration made by Lord Hartington in March 1886:—

'When I look back to the declarations that Mr Gladstone made in Parliament, which have not been infrequent; when I look back to the increased definiteness given to these declarations in his address to the electors of Midlothian and in his Midlothian speeches; when I consider all these things, I feel that I have not, and that no one has, any right to complain of the declaration that Mr Gladstone has recently made' (iii, 293).

It must be added that Mr Morley declares emphatically that the story of his being concerned in Mr Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule is 'pure moonshine.' 'I only glance at it,' he says, 'because in politics people are ready to believe anything.'

We have exhausted our space, but not our subject. There is only one thing to be said in conclusion. Our own appreciation of so vast and complex a subject is of necessity superficial, discontinuous, and fragmentary. But no one can read Mr Morley's survey of Mr Gladstone's life as a whole without feeling that here was a man of commanding intellect, of exemplary conduct in all the relations of private life, of untiring devotion to public duty, of almost superhuman industry and application, of lightning rapidity of apprehension, insight, and grasp, of infinite variety of parts, of frequently erring policies, but of lofty aims, of questionable actions not a few, but never of base motives or unworthy ambitions—in a word, a man who set before himself a high standard in public and private life, and never willingly deviated from it. Mr Morley shall speak for the last time:—

'The more you make of his errors the more is the need to explain his vast renown, the long reign of his authority, the substance and reality of his powers. We call men great for many reasons, apart from service wrought or eminence of intellect or even from force and depth of character. To have taken a leading part in transactions of decisive moment; to have proved himself able to meet demands on which high issues hung; to combine intellectual qualities, though moderate, yet adequate and sufficient, with the moral qualities needed for the given circumstance—with daring, circumspection, energy, intrepid initiative; to have fallen in with one of those occasions in the world that impart their own greatness even to a mediocre actor, and surround his name with a halo not radiating from within, but shed upon him from without—in all these and many other ways men come to be counted great. Mr Gladstone belongs to the rarer class who acquire authority and fame by transcendent qualities of genius within, in half independence of any occasions beyond those they create for themselves' (iii, 540-1).

It is idle to deny that Mr Gladstone's name and character have lost much of their influence since his death. He represented and evoked a phase of national thought too

high-flown and quixotic, it may be, certainly too much immersed in the sordid traffic of party politics, to be permanent. Have we lost nothing by its eclipse? He stood for one ideal—the rarer one by far—in political life and action, as Bismarck, his greatest contemporary, stood for the other—the commoner and the more acceptable to the natural man. On the one hand, the gospel of force, nakedly avowed, the policy of blood and iron ruthlessly pursued, the ethics of Machiavelli combined with the duplicity of our own Elizabeth; on the other, a sustained conviction that what is wrong in private life cannot be right in public life, a large and expanding love of freedom, a life-long endeavour to raise politics to the ethical level of Christianity itself—in a word, the materialism of politics contrasted with their idealism. We know not whether the publication of Mr Morley's biography will tend in any degree to re-establish Mr Gladstone's moral ascendancy over the minds and consciences of his countrymen. But now that the dross of circumstance and the unseemly stains of party conflict and misunderstanding are being gradually disengaged by time from the fine gold of his true personality, it were surely not amiss that it should. For, after all, it was this that gave him his power, this that established his immense ascendancy; and no one has better divined the true secret of his greatness than the statesman whose loss we are now in turn deploring, the greatest and not the least generous of his later opponents.

'What he sought,' said Lord Salisbury at the time of Mr Gladstone's death, 'was the achievement of great ideals; and, whether they were based on sound convictions or not, they could have issued from nothing but the greatest and the purest moral aspirations; and he is honoured by his countrymen, because, through so many years, through so many vicissitudes and conflicts, they have recognised this one characteristic of his action, which has never left it, nor ceased to colour it. He will leave behind him, especially to those who have followed with deep interest the history of his later years—I might almost say the later months of his life—he will leave behind him the memory of a great Christian statesman.'

Art. XI.—THE CABINET AND THE WAR OFFICE.

1. *Report of His Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Military Preparations and other matters connected with the War in South Africa.* 1903. [Cd. 1789-92.]
2. *Report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the system under which Patterns of Warlike Stores are adopted, and the Stores obtained and passed for Her Majesty's Service.* 1887. [C. 5062.]
3. *Preliminary and further Reports of the Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Civil and Professional Administration of the Naval and Military departments, and the relation of those departments to each other and the Treasury.* 1890. [C. 5979.]

THE British nation, in the autumn of 1899, was disturbed by the suspicion that something had gone wrong with the arrangements of which the outcome was the campaign then beginning in South Africa. During that whole summer, or, at any rate, since the middle of June, the one question of absorbing interest had been whether there was to be a war in South Africa or not. This question was definitely settled on the 10th of October, when the Boer ultimatum was received in London. A short period of suspense followed, during which it was discovered that the brunt of the Boer attack would have to be borne by Sir George White with the comparatively small force just reaching completion in Natal. On October 20 the battle of Talana Hill gave satisfactory proof that the British soldier still had all his old qualities; but the retreat of General Yule from Dundee a day or two later, followed on October 30 by the unfortunate battle of Farquhar's Farm with the disaster of Nicholson's Nek, and, on November 2, by the investment of Ladysmith, revealed a situation which filled the public with alarm. The fate of the Empire appeared to be hanging in the balance; and it was evident that weeks must elapse before any exertions made at home could produce a material change of the situation in the theatre of war.

The natural instinct of most men led them to suppose that the Government was responsible for this state of things; and the opinion was freely expressed that Lord

Lansdowne, as Secretary of State for War, was the person who, according to the constitution, ought to be called to account. The Government in general, and the War Office in particular, admitted responsibility, but denied misconduct; and several ministers directly accepted the challenge implied by the prevailing tone of public opinion. Mr Wyndham, then Under-Secretary of State for War, speaking in the House of Commons on October 20, the day of the battle of Talana Hill, declared that 'the policy which the Government adopted was deliberately adopted with the fullest knowledge of all that it might involve.' Lord Lansdowne, speaking at Sheffield on November 2, affirmed that the situation which existed during the first six weeks of the war was inevitable; that there had been no failure; and that it was impossible for any government, in conducting a dispute with a distant state, to maintain harmony between its negotiations and its naval and military preparations. Mr Balfour, speaking at Manchester so late as January 8, 1900, maintained that from the beginning to the end of the year 1899 the Government had at every stage taken the right step. His proofs, however, consisted in little more than the history of his own opinions. He himself had not expected war until the last moment; and therefore it could not have been right for the Government to make serious preparations for the war at any earlier moment. On January 30, 1900, the Marquis of Salisbury, speaking in his place as Prime Minister in the House of Lords, said, 'I do not believe in the perfection of the British constitution as an instrument of war. . . . It is evident there is something in your machinery that is wrong.' The temper produced by these speeches, and by the conduct of the war, expressed itself in a demand for an enquiry; and the Government promised that, at the close of the war, such an enquiry should be held.

The war came to an end on May 31, 1902. On September 9 a Royal Commission was appointed 'to enquire into the military preparations for the War in South Africa, and into the supply of men, ammunition, equipment, and transport by sea and land in connection with the campaign, and into the military operations up to the occupation of Pretoria.' The members of the Commission were Lord Elgin, Lord Esher, Sir George Taubman Goldie, Sir Henry Norman, Sir John Hopkins, Sir John

Edge, and Sir John Jackson; Lord Strathcona and Sir Frederic Darley were subsequently added to the number. The Commission spent fifty-five days in examining 114 witnesses and recording the answers to more than 22,000 questions. Their Report, which fills 143 pages of the Blue-book, was signed on July 9, 1903, and issued to the public towards the close of August, after the prorogation of Parliament.

The first difficulty which besets a Royal Commission is the interpretation of its instructions—the formation of a clear conception of the purpose which it has to fulfil. There can be little doubt as to the purpose which was present in the mind of the public and in that of the Government, at the time when this enquiry was demanded and promised. On the eve of the war the army was believed to be in an unprecedented state of efficiency; and the general expectation was that the resistance of the Boers would be easily and quickly overcome. This general expectation was bitterly disappointed. When Sir George White's force was besieged in Ladysmith, and Natal overrun, a confident hope was entertained that the arrival of the army corps would turn the balance, and be speedily followed by the collapse of the Boers. But when the army corps arrived, its parts were scattered over the sub-continent and checked and defeated in detail. In ordinary circumstances the sense of disillusionment produced by these events would have brought about the fall of the Government. But the Opposition was divided; many of its leaders and a large part of its rank and file were unable to convince themselves that the cause to which the nation was committed was just. It was impossible to entrust to them the conduct of a war that had arisen in pursuance of a policy which they condemned. The course, therefore, deliberately adopted by the nation was to support the Government in a vigorous prosecution of the war at all costs, subject to the condition that on its close there should be a thorough enquiry.

It has been necessary to refer to the temper of the public mind at the end of the year 1900, because that is the explanation of the great expectations with which the Report was awaited. Yet it was impossible for these

expectations to be fulfilled. War is political action—the employment of forces for the attainment of political ends. A review of its management must be a review of policy and of strategy, and of their interaction upon one another. Any attempt to enter thoroughly into questions of policy might have exposed the Commission to the suspicion of a partisan bias, a suspicion which would have sufficed to discredit its labours; and after a war in which all the ablest military servants of the Crown had been engaged either as combatants or as members of the War Office staff, no tribunal could have been composed that could have combined the professional competence needed for an authoritative judgment on questions of strategy and tactics with the disinterested impartiality of persons whose own conduct was not under review.

The Commission recognised the restrictions thus imposed by the nature of the case upon the scope of their work. They decided not to be influenced by the ideas which had been current among the public when the enquiry was demanded and promised. If their instructions gave them a discretion, they held themselves bound to exercise it ‘unfettered by any demands which might have been made upon the Government before their appointment, and which had not been embodied in their instructions or communicated officially.’* They decided to exclude political questions so far as possible from their purview,† and agreed that ‘they were not so constituted as to enable them to pronounce judgment on questions of strategy or tactics.’‡ The Commission considered

‘that the object of their appointment was to discover inefficiency or defects in the administration of the army where disclosed by the facts of the war in South Africa, and to indicate their causes wherever possible’;§

the possibility being obviously bounded partly by the evidence obtainable and partly by the qualifications of the Commission itself. The Report warns the reader that

‘it does not fall within the province of the Commission to deal with the whole military system in detail, or to submit

* Report, p. 1.

† Ib. p. 26: ‘Considerations of this kind are not within the purview of this Commission.’ p. 117: ‘Decisions arrived at on grounds other than military, and therefore outside the reference to the Commission,’

‡ Ib. p. 2.

§ Ib. pp. 1, 2.

an elaborate scheme for the reorganisation of the army';* and that 'War Office organisation and its reform involve questions so numerous, so important, and so complicated, that it would, under any circumstances, be inexpedient to include their detailed consideration in an enquiry which had to cover a great deal of ground in other directions and for other purposes.'†

The restricted interpretation which the Commission wisely placed upon its instructions, and the modest opinion which it entertained of its own competence, render it necessary to distinguish clearly between what the Report is and what it is not. It is not an authoritative review of the causes of the disasters of 1899; it does not offer a solution of the problem, which the nation has to solve, of efficiency in the management of the army and in preparations for war. It does not even offer guidance to be followed in the effort for reform. Its minutes of evidence and the documents contained in the appendices form a copious storehouse of facts and of the opinions of soldiers and administrators. The Report is a guide to those facts and opinions, with the comments of an intelligent and fair-minded jury, which has studiously refrained from attempting to decide any of the difficult questions that can properly be answered only by means of special knowledge.

Of the four sections into which the Report is divided the most important are the first, dealing with the military preparations for the war in South Africa, and the last, discussing questions of War Office organisation.

These two sections disclose the cardinal weakness of the British system of government in so far as it is concerned with war and with the army, a weakness in the organisation for direction. The other two sections treat of the supply of men and of ammunition, equipment, and transport by sea and land. In these branches also such failure as there was appears to have been due rather to the weakness of the directing head than to that of the executive hand. Thus the arrangements for the supply of men were far more complete than might have been expected. The military branch of the War Office had been instructed since 1888 that it might have at the

* Report, p. 2.

† *Ib.* p. 132.

utmost to send abroad two army corps, a cavalry division, and troops for the line of communications. This was considered an extreme and improbable demand. But it was amply complied with. The troops sent to South Africa were, moreover, continuously provided with all the necessary supplies of an army. Generally speaking, there was no breakdown in this respect; and such failures as have been proved against the War Office under the head of supply concern either the remounts department, as to which there has already been elaborate enquiry, or the artillery branch in its general direction, which is a part of the headquarters organisation. The general conclusion of the Commission regarding the supply of troops is,

'that no military system will be satisfactory which does not contain powers of expansion outside the limit of the regular forces of the Crown, whatever that limit may be.'*

This conclusion may be freely endorsed; but a full examination of its import may with advantage be reserved until the Royal Commission now enquiring into the militia and volunteer forces has concluded its labours.

On the question of the preparations for the war, the Commission, while giving a fairly complete record of the facts, has exercised great reserve in the expression of opinions. They think Lord Wolseley not entirely free from blame.

'The general impression to be derived from the whole circumstances must be that the special function of the Commander-in-Chief, under the Order in Council of 1895, viz. "the preparation of schemes of offensive and defensive operations," was not exercised on this occasion in any systematic fashion.'†

The Government, too, the Commission thinks, cannot be altogether exculpated.

'On the one side, we have the decision of the Government, which limited the additions of men and stores for political reasons'‡ (reasons as to which the Commission declines to pronounce§); 'on the other, it has been stated by Lord Lansdowne that the garrison of South Africa at the outbreak of the war had received reinforcements at least as large as the official military advisers of the Government had recommended.

* Report, p. 83.

† *Ib.* p. 22.

‡ *Ib.* p. 30.

§ *Ib.* p. 26.

We have felt bound to say that the papers appear to us to support that contention. More than the reinforcement of 10,000 men suggested had been sent to South Africa; and the arrangements for the mobilisation of the Army Corps and Cavalry Division, which were to follow, were so complete that no serious delay occurred in their despatch. Whether, if the information collected by the Intelligence Department had been used to greater purpose, it would have resulted in a larger reinforcement of the garrison of South Africa, it is impossible to say. It certainly appears now that, with a greater amount of forethought in arrangements generally—in the provision of stores and equipment, and with the addition of perhaps another brigade—the situation in Natal might have been so strengthened that the whole course of the war must have been altered. It is difficult to estimate the effect of the initial successes of the Boers. That they encouraged large efforts is indisputable; but, on the other hand, they thus led to the greater disasters, such as Paardeberg, and postponed the stage of guerilla warfare, which is most suited to Boer tactics. And in determining the measure of responsibility for any deficiencies, it must be remembered that no one, even in the Intelligence Department, ever anticipated the Boers to be capable of so sustained an effort on a large scale. It was "a dash at Natal" that was apprehended. That apprehension, however, may be said to have been communicated to the Cabinet; it certainly was in the hands of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as well as of the Secretary of State for War. It was an apprehension of which civilians could well take cognisance; and, though undoubtedly it lay with the military heads of the War Office to develop and insist upon the danger which it involved, as indeed Sir John Ardagh did insist in his memorandum of 15th April, 1897, we are not prepared to say that, in estimating the admitted risks of the policy which they adopted, the Cabinet itself gave due consideration to this very essential point.*

The Commission reports that,

'for at least three years before the outbreak of the war, the Intelligence Department of the War Office had been fully aware of the warlike preparations in the Republics, and had recognised that the only object of these preparations could be to provide for hostilities with the British Government.'† But the Commission 'were definitely informed by Lord Lansdowne that the papers of the Intelligence Division were never

* Report, p. 30.

† Ib. p. 30.

officially communicated to him as the basis of any proposals through the regular channel, i.e. by order of the Commander-in-Chief.*

These are the main conclusions of the Commission with regard to the preparations for the war. They are the groundwork of the principal generalisation reached by the Commission in that part of its Report which treats of the War Office.

'No defect in War Office organisation has excited more hostile criticism than the want of consultative power which has characterised its administration';†

and the main preoccupation of the Commission, in its suggestions for improvement, is that provision should be made for increasing the 'consultative power' at the disposal of the Government.

The terms in which the Report expresses these balanced and guarded opinions, reflect the character and composition of the Commission. Its members were sincere, impartial, considerate, reluctant to censure any one. But they were unable to throw into the scale the decisive weight of well-known and established principles governing the subject with which they have to deal. They felt debarred from considering the problem of policy; they held themselves incapable of resolving the questions of strategy. They were conscious that they were treating a diseased organism; but their diagnosis was uncertain, their prescription for treatment timid and tentative. The nation that should attempt to cure itself according to such halting advice would become a confirmed invalid. If a remedy is to be found, it must be based upon a diagnosis guided by principles beyond the reach of controversy.

War is a form of political action. It is action by the State—by the nation as a constituted body. It is always directed by the national government, which determines, so far as it can determine anything, the causes for which it will fight and the occasion when it will fight for them; which chooses the moment for entering into controversy with another state, and alone has power to order military

* Report, p. 22,

† *Ib.*, p. 138,

preparations; which selects the commander of its forces, determines the amount of force with which he is to be supplied, reserves to itself the approval of his plans, and decides when and under what conditions peace is to be made. No nation, and therefore no government, is the absolute master of its destinies, for attack may be made upon it against its will and without its foreknowledge; but even for such cases a government alone can make provision, and for so doing it is answerable to the nation which has entrusted it with the direction of its affairs. For all that concerns war, for the action that leads to it as well as the action or inaction which evades it, a government must ever be responsible to the nation; and for that reason the government in every country retains the supreme authority at all times over all that concerns the wars in which it may be engaged.

A government then, being the trustee for the nation, is answerable in regard to disputes with other nations for two things: first, that it shall be in the right, and secondly, that it shall succeed. It is possible that these two things are closely intertwined. The present enquiry is concerned only with the second branch, the effectiveness of the means used to carry out the purpose asserted by a government in dispute with another government.

The primary condition of success in war is harmony between policy and strategy. By policy is meant the purpose of the government in its dealings with a foreign state, and by strategy the employment of forces for the accomplishment of that purpose, including the forethought which provides the necessary forces at the right time and place. It is the function of the supreme authority to maintain this harmony, for the simple reason that to maintain it is not in the power of any one else. In the case of a military monarch, who is his own strategist, no question arises; but where the supreme authority is in the hands of a committee of civilians, it is evidently for the supreme committee to secure the connexion between policy and strategy. In this all-important function the element of time is vital. No army in the world is kept quite ready for war; there is always something to be done. Plans must be considered; reserves must be called out; the troops must receive their war equipment; they must be collected at some place; and arrangements must

be made for moving them. All these things take time. If a government begins quarrelling with a foreign power, but waits to consult its strategist until the foreign army has crossed the border, there will probably be hurry and confusion. The proper moment for consultation with the strategist is evidently the moment when the government raises a question, or when a foreign power raises a question, which, being contentious, may possibly lead to hostilities.

These are incontrovertible principles which must be applied to the facts recited in the first part of the Commission's Report. It appears that the possibility of a serious quarrel with the South African Republic, of a quarrel which might render military action necessary, had been repeatedly before the Government since 1895. The crisis was reached in the early summer of 1899, when the vital question of suzerainty came to a head. The Bloemfontein Conference marks the moment when the Cabinet deliberately raised an issue the outcome of which might be war. Three days after the Conference, in a minute dated June 8, Lord Wolseley raised 'the pressing question for the Government to consider at this moment—to what extent shall we prepare for the contingency of war with the Transvaal?' and expressed the opinion that for that event

'we should require, in addition to the force now in South Africa, one complete Army Corps, one Cavalry Division, and one battalion of mounted Infantry. For the line of communication we should require four battalions.'

He suggested a number of preliminary preparations, and proposed that one army corps and a cavalry division should be mobilised at once on Salisbury Plain, preferably with their reserves.

The Commission reports that this proposal for mobilising an army corps and a cavalry division was never seriously entertained by the Government. A month later, on July 7, Lord Wolseley again urged the immediate mobilisation of one army corps and one cavalry division, and suggested the sending to South Africa, at a very early date, of one infantry division and one cavalry brigade—10,000 men. There is no sign that this proposal was seriously considered; but on August 2 the

Government decided to send 2000 men to Natal. On August 18 Lord Wolseley wrote a minute, intended for submission to the Cabinet, ending with the statement, 'In my opinion we have arrived at a moment when it would be unsafe and unwise to delay further action.' To this Lord Lansdowne replied that the outlook in South Africa had improved.

'We are not yet' (he said) 'in a position to assume that matters will be satisfactorily settled; but Mr Chamberlain wrote to me two days ago that, while he wished to avoid relaxing the pressure, he saw no occasion for reinforcements.'

Lord Wolseley in his reply assumed that the Cabinet had information not known to the Press. From what he could see, Mr Kruger was preparing for war.

'At this moment we are *not* locally prepared for war in South Africa; so that, if it comes upon us under present circumstances, we shall surrender the initiative to Kruger.'

On August 27 Lord Lansdowne in reply said:—

'My own view is that we ought not to send further reinforcements to South Africa until it has become clear that the last proposals made by the South African Republic cannot be accepted as a basis for discussion.'

On Sept. 5 Sir Redvers Buller wrote to Lord Salisbury:—

'As you ask for my ideas, I give them to you privately. I am not happy as to the way things are going. There must be some period at which the military and the diplomatic or political forces are brought into line; and, in my view, this ought to be before action is determined on—in other words, before the diplomat proceeds to an ultimatum the military should be in a position to enforce it. This is not the case with regard to affairs in South Africa. So far as I am aware the War Office has no idea of how matters are proceeding, and has not been consulted. I mean that they do not know how fast diplomacy is moving.'

On the same day Lord Wolseley wrote to Lord Lansdowne:—

'The Government are acting without complete knowledge of what the military can do, while the military authorities are equally without full knowledge of what the Government expects them to do, nor are they given authority to make

such antecedent preparations as will enable them to act with the least possible delay. The result is that the Government—under a false idea of the rapidity with which we can act—may bring matters to a crisis too soon. I submit that it is urgently necessary that our diplomacy and our military preparations should work hand in hand.'

The 10,000 men asked for by Lord Wolseley on July 7 were not ordered out until September 8; and the mobilisation of an army corps and cavalry division, and the communication troops asked for by him on June 8, were not ordered until October 7.

These are the main facts, which, in the Commission's narrative, are overlaid by a multitude of comparatively subordinate details. If we apply to them the principle already set forth, is it not plain that the Government stands convicted of failure to harmonise strategy and policy? From June 8 to September 8 the Cabinet deliberately neglected the most important part of all the strategical advice which it received. If the Cabinet as a body is to blame, Lord Lansdowne, as the minister who formed the connecting link between the Cabinet as the supreme authority and the Commander-in-Chief as its strategical adviser, must be held especially accountable. The nation is entitled to take up the challenge thrown down by Mr Wyndham in his speech of October 20, and by Lord Lansdowne in his speech of November 2. It is at least an open question whether Lord Wolseley was justified in retaining his post as the principal adviser of the Secretary of State on all military questions, considering that, during four months, his advice on the most important of all questions—the preparations for a war which he saw coming—was constantly neglected.

The Commission appears to think that there are excuses for Lord Lansdowne and for the Cabinet; and therefore, before the judgment just suggested can be made absolute, it is necessary to examine these excuses. The first is that the Government acted for political reasons—reasons which the Commission regards as beyond the scope of its enquiry. Two political reasons have been given. In the first place it has been alleged that the Government could not feel sure in June 1899 that the preparations suggested by Lord Wolseley, in particular the calling-out of the reserves, would have had

the support of the nation.* This defence would be fatal to the Government; for, if it was doubtful whether the national conscience would approve of calling out the reserves, the doubt ought to have prevented the adoption of a policy which might necessitate that step.

A more plausible reason is that given in Lord Lansdowne's letters to Lord Wolseley of August 20 and August 27, that the situation had improved, and that any demonstration of force might precipitate the crisis. This is an intelligible position, and therefore deserves a fair and impartial examination. What would be the consequences if the idea underlying Lord Lansdowne's words were adopted as a principle? Under what conditions may a government, engaged in a dispute with a foreign power, postpone its preparations in order not to precipitate a war, which, if the preparations are not made, may possibly be avoided? Such a government must be assumed to be clear as to the justice of its case, and as to its duty to use force if no other means will suffice. Evidently, if the neglect of preparations were such as to give the other side a decided advantage in case of war, the Government would have prejudiced the cause of its own nation and presumably the cause of justice and right. Accordingly, no essential preparation necessary to success ought to be neglected on this score.

The principle, therefore, of postponing necessary preparations lest they may provoke the other side, is inadmissible. The avoidance of needless provocation must be effected in the region not of strategy but of policy; it will be secured, if it can be secured at all, by sincerity in diplomatic intercourse. In June 1899 the ambiguity, if there was any, was hardly on the side of the Boers. Mr Kruger's declaration on the subject of sovereignty left nothing to be desired on the score of clearness. His refusal to accept the proposals made to him at Bloemfontein was categorical. There was no doubt on either side as to the grave significance of the rupture of negotiations at Bloemfontein. Lord Wolseley's minutes show clearly enough that, in his judgment, the strategical position would be modified to Great Britain's prejudice

* This was part of Mr Balfour's argument of January 8, 1900, when he said that 'unanimity was worth many army corps.' Was it worth many thousand deaths that could have been avoided?

by the postponement of preparation. The doubtful point was whether Great Britain would fight, a doubt which the history of many previous years rendered natural enough in the mind of Mr Kruger and his colleagues. The best way to resolve that doubt would have been to make the preparations which Lord Wolseley proposed.

The statement that the situation had improved is significant of the frame of mind of the Government. Mr Kruger, on going home from Bloemfontein, must have thought war exceedingly probable, and could hardly have been astonished if he had received news of extensive military preparations in England; but the military preparations which took place were insignificant. His anxiety would therefore become less urgent; and he would be willing to negotiate, in order to discover whether Great Britain would not be satisfied with something less than he had refused to concede at Bloemfontein. This represents what actually happened; and the conclusion seems justified that the improvement in the situation which Mr Chamberlain and Lord Lansdowne thought they saw was merely the reflection of their own hesitation. So much for political reasons for delay of preparation.

Lord Lansdowne defends his action by throwing the blame on his military advisers. He points out

'that the garrison of South Africa at the outbreak of the war had received reinforcements at least as large as the official military advisers of the Government had recommended.'

This excuse the Commission accepts and endorses. In other words, the Commission is of opinion that 2000 men ordered out on August 2, and 10,000 men on September 8, are the strategical equivalent in every sense of 10,000 men ordered out in the first half of July and supported by an army corps and other troops mobilised in England in the first half of June. On this point it is sufficient to say that in strategy, in regard to which the Commission disclaims competence, nothing is more vital than time; ten policemen at the beginning of a riot may be better than forty after it has been given time to develop. The Commission appears to assume, as something obvious, that Lord Wolseley's proposals were entirely inadequate. It complains that he failed in his function of preparation of

schemes of operation, and it states with emphasis that no one ever anticipated the Boers to be capable of so sustained an effort on a large scale. The fact that in December much more extensive forces were required than were ordered out in October, can hardly be quoted as justifying the Government for neglecting the suggestions of its military adviser in June. The Commission readily assumes, in the light of subsequent events, that Lord Wolseley's proposals were insufficient, as, for example, when, on August 18, he suggested that the addition of 10,000 men to the garrison of Natal would render that colony secure. Their grounds for this belief are that Sir George White, with such a force as Lord Wolseley demanded, was, in fact, unable effectually to defend the colony; but Lord Wolseley, on August 18, certainly did not contemplate the force which he wished to send to Natal being left for many weeks to bear the whole brunt of a Boer attack while the Boers were free from molestation in other quarters. His opinion was that an army corps should advance through the Free State; and it is inconceivable that he should have calculated on the indefinite postponement of this larger operation. Moreover, in the opinion both of Lord Wolseley and of Lord Roberts, the two British generals who had the longest experience of command in the field, and therefore the two highest strategical authorities, the force in Natal might well have been better handled than it was. The excuses, therefore, set up by the Commission in palliation of judgment on the action of the Cabinet cannot be admitted; and the judgment must stand that the Cabinet as a body, and Lord Lansdowne in particular, failed in discharging their prime duty to the nation in regard to preparation for the war, namely, that of maintaining the harmony between their policy and their military preparations.

This is the vital spot. Here lies the disease. Unless the portion of the organism that serves this purpose can be put right, the body politic and military cannot recover its health. In order to find the cure, the diagnosis must be carried further. The Cabinet did not, in fact, adopt the proposals of Lord Wolseley; they overruled his judgment on the cardinal point of time. It is, therefore, not,

for them to allege that Lord Wolseley's proposals were insufficient. That may be the case, but can hardly be proved. A study of his minutes shows that he was fully alive to the need for having abundant forces in readiness for the purpose of prompt reinforcement. On November 3, five weeks before Colenso, he urged the mobilisation of the second army corps, and next day proposed to complete the third. The actual events proved that these forces could have followed quickly on the heels of those that had already been sent. Had the first army corps and the force of Sir George White been ordered out in July and sent in quick succession, and had their handling been judicious, there need hardly have been the disasters which occurred; and the second and third army corps might well have been sufficient to conclude the war.

But though Lord Wolseley's ideas may have been sound, it can hardly be contended that they were so laid before the Cabinet as to be likely to open the eyes of that body. Lord Wolseley took the standpoint of a dogmatic and authoritative adviser. His advice was, 'so many troops, and at once.' But what was wanted was a reasoned explanation of the probable character of the coming war, setting forth the nature of the difficulties, and the right way of overcoming them. Such a memorandum should have set out from the political situation, which was no secret, and supplied a starting-point that would appeal to the Cabinet. The memorandum would have pointed out that the issue turned upon 'sovereignty,' that is upon the independence of the Transvaal; that for independence, if they think it in question, men will fight with great energy and determination. It would have shown that in such a war the objective must be the enemy's forces; and that the only way to conclude it would be by crushing and disarming the whole of the armed population, not only of the Transvaal, but probably also of the Free State. A memorandum of this nature would have revealed to the Government the magnitude of the task involved in their policy, and it ought to have been in their hands early in 1899. The Cabinet would then have had properly before it the problem of reconciling policy and military arrangements. Its members would, perhaps, have been ready to enter into deliberations, to which Lord Wolseley might have been a party; and he would then

have developed the ideas of the memorandum. He would, perhaps, have pointed out the difficulty of fighting an army of horsemen with an army composed mainly of infantry, and might have gained the Cabinet's sanction for passing large numbers of the infantry through the riding-school. Some such procedure was due from the strategical adviser to the Government.

Unfortunately, the arrangements which would have secured such a systematic treatment of any problems of policy from the military side did not exist. The relations between the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief had been rendered delicate by the decision which, in 1895, when Lord Wolseley was appointed, had made the Secretary of State the real head of the chief military departments, and left the Commander-in-Chief 'the fifth wheel of the coach.' It will presently be seen that the organisation of the War Office by no means favoured the systematic pursuit of strategy and of the higher branches of the art of war, even within the Office. The failure, therefore, to harmonise policy and military measures was not merely in the political body, the Cabinet. There was serious failure at the War Office on the military side: There was also serious strategical failure in South Africa, where success was denied to the generals one after another until the arrival of Lord Roberts on the Modder River.

The problem is to secure harmony between policy and strategy. Its solution requires not only arrangements for securing the influence of strategy in the decisions of the Government, but also arrangements for the production of good strategy in the army.

Strategy is the art of generalship, of which the object is victory. If we are to make arrangements for providing it, we must examine the functions performed by the General who leads an army against an enemy. His principal though not his only function consists in the direction of the movements of the troops. The troops themselves are under the immediate control and guidance of a number of commanders subordinate to the chief. The whole army is directed by instructions furnished to these subordinates by the General—instructions which, as they have the force of categorical commands, are known as

orders. The series of these orders embodies the series of moves in the game, the General's business being to determine these moves and to see that they are carried out. The settlement of each new move is like the solution of a problem. In this respect, and in this respect only, war resembles a game of chess; so that its history, as regards generalship, is made up of the series of orders issued by the two opposing commanders, by the aid of which the operations can be followed on the map as a game of chess is followed on the board by a record of the moves of each side. The difference between war and chess is that in chess the intellectual solution of the problem is everything, while in war the great difficulty is, given the intellectual solution, to get the pieces moved. We may say that the General's function is a double one—the conception and the execution of operations; but that the great difficulty lies in the execution. The obstacles to be overcome by the will of the General are more formidable than those to be overcome by his intellect. For this reason his solutions of his problems become commands; the characteristic feature of his relation to the whole army is authority. If he attains to greatness it is as a great commander that he is known.

Besides determining and directing the moves of his army, the General has other duties. He must maintain the discipline of his army, and must take care that it is regularly supplied with all that it needs. He cannot be at home to prepare the necessary supplies, but he must keep his eye on the arrangements for moving them from his base to the parts of his army. He must also keep in touch with the Government, so that his strategy may be the servant of the national policy. There is no means of supplementing the General's faculty of decision or of diminishing either his authority over his army or his responsibility to his Government, both of which must remain absolute. But there is a well-established method of assisting him in the other parts of his task. Now and then appears the genius who is above systems, and has his own methods. But for the normal man a system is helpful.

In the system of modern European armies the duty of submitting projects of operations to the Commander-in-Chief has devolved upon an officer known as the Quarter-

master-General, or, in the French army of the eighteenth century, as 'maréchal-général des logis d'une armée.' The relations of this officer to the commander of an army are clearly described by General Bourcet, in a work * written long before the French Revolution.

'A maréchal-général des logis is the soul of an army. He ought to have acquired, by his experience and application, the knowledge of the most sublime parts of war, for he must combine, must examine, and must foresee events, and in order, with a good judgment, to make the best of the circumstances in which he may find himself, his mind must be able to furnish him with ideas or projects of operations. . . . All the ideas or projects of operations ought to be presented by him to the general, who ought not to be occupied except in rectifying them; for, having to keep up his correspondence with the minister of war, with the ambassadors, and with the different generals of the army, and to foresee everything connected with the ammunition and provisions, with the maintenance of the troops and their equipment, with their recruits or remounts, and with order and discipline, it would be impossible for the general every day to make the reconnaissances necessary to be able to plan movements, without neglecting some of these essential duties; it is therefore necessary that he should have assistance, and that some one should submit ideas to him.'

We have seen that the General's strategical function is the conception and execution of movements against the enemy, technically known as 'operations.' The Quartermaster-General can assist him in the conception, because he is his chief assistant in the execution. His functions are to ascertain what can be known of the enemy and of the country, to keep a record of the position and condition of every part of the army, and to compose and issue the orders for operations. He has charge of the movements of the army, which, in the eighteenth century, were treated as changes from one camp to another, or changes of 'quarters.' He reconnoitred and selected the sites of the camps or quarters, and regulated the movement from one camp, or set of camps, to the next, this being the origin of his title.

In the Quartermaster-General's office, as in that of the

* Bourcet, 'Principes de la guerre de montagnes,' chapter viii.

General, conception and execution are inseparable. But, while the General has authority over the army, and is responsible to the Government, the Quartermaster-General is a mere deputy acting under the General's authority; and while the Quartermaster-General has no functions beyond those just described, the General has to control the whole army in respect of its discipline and all its administration in the field. He has other assistants for his other functions, so that the Quartermaster-General's is but one of several offices which, together, form the General's staff. Of this staff the Quartermaster-General's branch is the most important; therefore, where the General requires a deputy for all purposes, as, for example, during a short absence, it is on the Quartermaster-General that his choice is most likely to fall. In some armies the officer who performs his duties is officially recognised as the General's deputy, and is called 'Chief of the Staff.' In some cases, as in Prussia, the name 'General Staff' does not include the other branches at all, but merely denotes the Quartermaster-General's branch. A commander without a Quartermaster-General would be crippled; he would have to do the work himself, and thereby be prevented from proper attention to his other duties.

In Bourcet's opinion the Quartermaster-General's office is the place in which officers can best learn 'the sublime parts of war,' i.e. strategy and tactics. He points out that the Quartermaster-General will confidentially discuss his projects with his assistants, and says 'it is in these private conversations that the best officers can be formed.' Grimoard, another officer of the old royal French army, describes the Quartermaster-General, from his being continually with the General and in his secrets, as 'really the second person in the army.' He was the principal officer of the 'État-major.' All other armies had the same office, and in all of them its attributions were similar.

The system was described by Lord Roberts before the Royal Commission. The combatant staff, or body of assistants of the Commander-in-Chief for war, was divided into two distinct branches, that of the Adjutant-General and that of the Quartermaster-General, each with clearly defined duties.

'Quartermaster-General: operations, marches and outposts, encampments, etc., reconnaissance and intelligence, issue of

operation orders, transport and supply.* Adjutant-General: discipline, administration, issue of general orders and regulations, returns.†

Lord Roberts has repeatedly expressed the opinion that the Quartermaster-General's branch is the branch in which officers receive the best training for the higher duties of war; and the practice of foreign armies confirms his judgment. But in 1888 the office was broken up by an Order in Council, and its functions distributed among other branches; though the title was retained for an officer at the War Office with but a shred of his former duties.

The disastrous results of this unfortunate change were seen in the South African war. There was a deficiency of properly trained staff-officers, and a lack of system in the work of the staff. Lord Roberts in his evidence, while speaking highly of the character of the officers, and of their devotion to duty, yet thought there was room for improvement. The first point, he says, is that they should take their profession more seriously; and

'the second point is a wide knowledge of war, especially in the higher branches, such as strategy, organisation, etc. Staff-officers' (he continued) 'cannot be improvised. . . . We cannot have a first-rate army unless we have a first-rate staff, well educated, constantly practised at manœuvres, and with wide experience. . . .‡ The Quartermaster-General's duties, which are for war the most important of all, are now divided amongst several departments; and the special duty of the Quartermaster-General in the field is not now learned by anybody. . . . The officers of this department should have a sound practical knowledge of both strategy and tactics.'§

The degradation, consummated in 1888, of the office and duties of the Quartermaster-General is the origin and prime cause of the strategical inefficiency of the army exhibited before and during the South African war.

* Transport and supply, as Lord Roberts afterwards pointed out, are usually under another officer—an intendant or commissary or head of transport.

† Report, Q. 10,447. A concise and accurate account of the old Quartermaster-General's functions was given before the Commission: minutes of evidence, vol. ii, p. 344, Q. 18,189. It is too long to be reproduced here, but deserves the most careful study.

‡ Report, Q. 10,447

§ *Ib.* Q. 10,447-10,450.

We come next to the office of Adjutant-General. From Lord Roberts' definition quoted above it is clear that, while in war the duties of Quartermaster-General are vital, those of the Adjutant-General—discipline, administration, regulations, and returns—fill a large place in the routine of peace, especially when returns are in constant demand for parliamentary purposes. During the long peace that followed the Crimean War, and with a Commander-in-Chief who had never commanded in war, the office of Adjutant-General acquired a preponderating importance. Its holder had a higher rank than the Quartermaster-General. It was necessary for Lord Wolseley, after he had been Quartermaster-General, if he was to continue to have influence at the War Office, to become Adjutant-General. Upon his appointment to that post its importance naturally increased, for Lord Wolseley was the guiding spirit of the military department. The constitutional delicacy of the position of a royal Commander-in-Chief made it necessary that some officer should be empowered to act as his deputy and be in touch with the Secretary of State. In these circumstances the Order in Council of 1888 laid down that

'the Adjutant-General, as the chief staff-officer of the Commander-in-Chief, will exercise general control over the duties of the military department, and in the Commander-in-Chief's absence, is empowered to act in his name. He is responsible to the Commander-in-Chief for the efficiency of the military forces of the crown.'*

The inevitable consequence of this arrangement was that the Adjutant-General's department, which is the red-tape office, swallowed up the Quartermaster-General's department, which is the office for strategy and tactics, or for the operations of war. The arrangement was bound to destroy the strategical efficiency of the army, both at headquarters and in the staffs of all the great combatant units. As regards the staffs in the field, this is proved by the concurrent evidence of Lord Roberts and other generals given before the Commission.

But this was not the only misfortune. To the same cause was due the weakness, such as there was, in the

* Appendices, p. 271.

strategical advice given to the Cabinet. The duties of the old Quartermaster-General

'comprised the movement, quartering, and encamping of troops; the disposition of troops in the field; the preparation of plans of defence, military surveys and reconnaissances, and the maintenance of a depot of military plans, maps, and memoirs, and of a military library.'*

This includes all the duties of mobilisation and intelligence, as they are nowadays understood. But the duties which, under the old system, would have been performed in the Quartermaster-General's branch of the Commander-in-Chief's office were, in 1899, distributed as follows:—†

The Commander-in-Chief was responsible for the preparation of schemes of operations, for the collection of military information, and for the general distribution of the army at home and abroad. In discharging these duties he had to rely for the collection of military information upon the Director of Intelligence, whose office was outside of, and at a distance from, the War Office. The Director was not authorised to prepare schemes of operations, but only to examine, strategically, schemes of defence, that is, schemes made by generals commanding districts at home or abroad, such schemes being strictly limited to the troops actually in their commands, and to defensive operations. This is why the Director of Intelligence prepared no detailed plan of campaign. Thus the theory was that the Commander-in-Chief received information from the Director of Intelligence; made for himself plans of operations, and then relied for the movement of the troops upon the limited and reduced Quartermaster-General, who, however, was not an officer of his staff, but of that of the Secretary of State. No wonder that the Commission surmises that there was some link missing between the reports of the Intelligence Division and the proposals of the Commander-in-Chief regarding the preparations for war in South Africa.

The first step needed to put strategy in the army on a proper footing is to restore the office of Quartermaster-

* Report, Q. 18,189.

† See Order in Council of November 21, 1895, in Appendix to Report, p. 272; and memorandum of the same date, pp. 274, 275.

General as the confidential assistant of the Commander-in-Chief in the planning of operations, and as the officer through whom the operation orders are issued. This would be done by transferring from the present Quartermaster-General to the Director of Mobilisation and Intelligence the function of 'movement of troops,' and restoring to his office, thus properly constituted, the old title of Quartermaster-General. This was proposed by Lord Roberts on his appointment as Commander-in-Chief; but the assent of the Secretary of State and of the Cabinet was refused,* and the change has not been made.

Mr Brodrick told the Commission that Lord Roberts felt very strongly on the subject, but that he (Mr Brodrick) could not agree. His words were:—

'I would submit it is of the first importance that the Director-General of Mobilisation and Intelligence should have no executive functions at all. I feel that we must have a brain to the British army. The man who has to do the thinking, to prepare the schemes . . . ought not to have his time taken up with writing letters and giving orders.'†

Thus Mr Brodrick is overruling the view of Lord Roberts on the nature of the 'Brain of an Army,' which he thinks he understands better than the man of whom he admits that he has 'such an unparalleled record.'‡

The reason for Mr Brodrick's action in this matter is that he was misinformed as to the practice of foreign armies, and, in particular, of the Prussian army. In that army there is just such a Quartermaster-General as is described and desired by Lord Roberts. He is called 'Chief of the General Staff,' that being the modern German name for what Lord Roberts calls the Quartermaster-General's branch. In the Prussian system the Quartermaster-General's office is, in peace as in war, more important than that of the Adjutant-General, whose office in the several army corps is of subordinate importance, while at headquarters most of the functions of the British Adjutant-General are performed by the 'Kriegsministerium.' The proposal of Lord Roberts to restore the office of Quartermaster-General is, in fact, a proposal to adopt in the British army the most essential feature of the Prussian staff system.

* Report, Q. 10,531-10,536, 10,560-61. † Ib. Q. 21,707. ‡ Ib. Q. 21,604.

The Prussian system has been persistently misrepresented to the British public. Thus, in the Report of the Hartington Commission, the dominant passage runs as follows :—

‘We are informed that, in the military systems of all the great Powers of Europe, there is a special department of the Chief of the Staff, freed from all executive functions, and charged with the responsible duty of preparing plans of military operations, collecting and co-ordinating information of all kinds, and generally tendering advice upon all matters of organisation and the preparation of the army for war. We consider that, by the creation of such a central *organising* department, the military defence of the Empire would be considered as a whole, and its requirements dealt with in accordance with a definite and harmonious plan.’

Sir Thomas Kelly-Kenny was asked by Lord Esher :—

‘Supposing there was an idea in Germany of converting their system of army corps into a totally different system, whose business in the German army would it be to draw up a scheme of that kind?’

Sir Thomas replied, ‘That would be the General Staff.’ Neither this answer nor the description of the German General Staff as an ‘organising department’ is in accordance with the facts. The organising department of the Prussian army is the ‘Kriegsministerium.’ The official ‘Text-book of Instruction in the Organisation of the Army’ says :—

‘The Prussian Kriegsministerium is the highest military office of the German Imperial army for matters of organisation, armament, and fortification, and for all administrative business. . . . The General Staff, under the Chief of the General Staff of the army, assisted by three Quartermasters-General, assists the Commander-in-Chief and the commanders of the greater units in strategical, tactical, and administrative business, and subserves scientific purposes.’

General Bronsart von Schellendorf, in his treatise on the Prussian General Staff, says :—

‘The Kriegsministerium must retain unrestricted its organising function, which secures the homogeneous formation, training, administration, and equipment of the army,’ and adds that ‘a guarantee for the utility of the efforts of the

Kriegsministerium in this direction lies in the fact that it can obtain, and often has asked for and obtained, the formal opinions upon special points of the Chief of the General Staff and of the generals commanding army corps.'

But, so far from the opinion of the Chief of the Staff being decisive, it is notorious that even in Moltke's time it was often overruled in points of organisation. Moltke, for example, would have preferred the organisation by divisions to that by army corps, which he found in existence.*

What the Hartington Commission meant by a department 'freed from all executive functions' it is hard to say; and it is equally hard to see why the opinion of an officer, whose only duty is to give opinions, should be of special value. The opinion of the German Chief of the Staff is thought valuable by the German Kriegsministerium precisely because he performs in war and in peace the duties of a Quartermaster-General. He is thought a good adviser on strategical subjects because his is, for strategical purposes, the executive office; his business is, under the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, to direct the action of the army in war. Nothing could be more ludicrous, were it not so serious a matter, than Mr Brodrick's refusal, on the ground that 'we must have a brain to the British army,' to permit the simple change by which Lord Roberts wishes to infuse into the British system the merits of the German institution which has been described under that name. The change proposed in 1900 by Lord Roberts, and steadily rejected by Mr Brodrick, is the only way in which to provide the army with a department of strategy and tactics, and to furnish the Commander-in-Chief with the organised assistance which every Commander-in-Chief requires for the systematic cultivation of the higher branches of the military art.

But this change alone will not suffice. It is necessary that the Commander-in-Chief should not be overworked. He must have leisure to reflect upon the matters which he has to decide; he must have time and freedom from

* See Moltke's memorandum No. 133, in his 'Militärische Korrespondenz—Krieg, 1864.'

worry to enable him, in Bourcet's eighteenth century language, to 'rectify' the 'ideas' submitted to him by the Quartermaster-General.

The Hartington Commission found the Commander-in-Chief's office overloaded. At that time the whole management of the army in every part was under the Commander-in-Chief's responsibility. The Hartington Commission could think of nothing better than abolishing the office, a suggestion which has been eagerly grasped by Lord Esher in his note to the recent Report. Neither the Hartington Commission nor Lord Esher seems ever to have thought of war.* But the proper way to approach this and every part of the problem is to start from the realities of war.

Let us, then, look again for a moment at actual war, and analyse the functions necessary for its being carried on. There is, on the one hand, a general in the field directing against the enemy the operations of an army which has been sent from home, and is continuously supplied from home with men, horses, weapons, and stores of all sorts. On the other hand, there is at home an office engaged in keeping up the strength of the army and in supplying it with everything necessary. Even in a war in which the army is fighting in its own country, the commander operating against the enemy will be as near the front as he can, while the arrangements for maintaining his army will be kept as far away from the enemy as possible. The first principle of good organisation for war being that every part of the machine should, so far as possible, be doing in peace what it would do in war, so that the transition from peace to war may cause a minimum of dislocation, it seems reasonable and natural to divide all the offices connected with an army into two groups according as, in war, they are to be parts of the actual fighting force or parts of the organisation for keeping it up to strength and in condition. This grouping or separation is the basis of every military organisation except the British. The late Sir George Chesney, for many years the able administrator of the Indian army, spent the later years of his life in the attempt to convince

* In the Hartington Commission's Report the only reference to war is the statement that in war a commander-in-chief in the field is appointed who reports to the Secretary of State, not to the Commander-in-Chief.

successive governments that it was necessary, in view of the requirements of war, to subdivide the management of the army into two branches, that of command and that of supply. Each of these functions is military; and the substance of Sir George Chesney's proposals* was that the departments of the War Office should be formed into two groups, one under the control of the Commander-in-Chief, the other under the control of a military Administrator-General for whom the title was proposed of Master-General of the Ordnance. Whatever may be thought of some of the details of the schemes worked out by Sir George Chesney, the general tendency of military opinion, especially of those soldiers who have had the largest experience of war, is in favour of the principle which he advocated.

Suppose, then, that the conditions of war, as understood by soldiers, were taken as a guide in the improvement of the War Office system, the result would be some such arrangement as follows. There would be, on the one hand, a military Administrator-General, who would be entrusted with the material maintenance, as distinct from the training, discipline, and leading, of the army. His office would superintend the levying of the number of men voted by Parliament in accordance with the legal terms of their service; he would be charged with the maintenance of all military units according to standard, and with the provision of arms, houses, land, and other material objects required by the army, according to standard. All the manufacturing departments of the army would be under his supervision; and in his office the estimates would be prepared. On the other hand, there would be a Commander-in-Chief charged with the strategical study of the national policy, with the duty of drawing up general plans of operations and of supervising the execution of such plans, and with the education and training of the army on a system adapted to the work it would have to perform in war. His agents would be (1) the Quartermaster-General or Chief of the Staff, for orders, for movements, for tactical regulations, for military intelligence, and for military education; (2)

* See Sir G. Chesney's article on the War Office in the 'Nineteenth Century,' Aug. 1891, reprinted in the same magazine, Feb. 1900.

the Military Secretary, for the selection and promotion of officers; and (3) the Adjutant-General, for discipline and disciplinary regulations. All the troops would be assigned to one or other army corps or division, according to the system adopted, so that the executive command of the troops would be in the hands of the generals commanding the divisions or army corps. The Commander-in-Chief would periodically inspect the several commands from the point of view of the generalship of their commanders and the training of the troops.

This is the natural and logical organisation of the army. It bases the peace arrangements on the needs of war. The department of the Administrator-General, as proposed by Sir George Chesney, corresponds closely with the department known in Prussia as the 'Kriegsministerium.' In Germany the great General Staff is the organ of strategy or generalship. The 'Kriegsministerium' is the organ of administration and supply. The differentiation and division of these two branches is the vital condition of the adequate working of either; and the General Staff is considered by General Bronsart to owe its brilliant development to its having been freed three-quarters of a century ago from the fetters of too close a connexion with the organ of administration and supply.

This vital reform was also proposed by Lord Roberts and vetoed by Mr Brodrick. Lord Roberts said:—

'I should like to see the War Office divided into three branches—military, spending departments, and financial—each with a head who, while acting in consultation with each other (*sic*), would be responsible to the Secretary of State. The military branch should comprise the offices of the Adjutant-General, Director-General of Mobilisation and Military Intelligence' (whom Lord Roberts would call Quartermaster-General), 'Director-General Army Medical Service, and Military Secretary. The spending departments would include the offices now under the Quartermaster-General, Inspector-General of Fortifications, and Director-General of Ordnance, the head being an officer of recognised administrative ability and without any political functions. The financial branch should be as at present. This subdivision of labour and responsibility would, I believe, greatly simplify the work now devolving on the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief, and give them more time

to devote to the more important problems of military efficiency and Imperial defence.*

Mr Brodrick objected to this arrangement. He thought 'it would put the Secretary of State in a very difficult position,' because the Administrator-General would be independent of the Commander-in-Chief, and might disagree with him, and then the Secretary of State might have to decide between the two. It is a peculiar objection to be urged by a Secretary of State who overrules Lord Roberts so freely. Of course it is essential that the Commander-in-Chief and the Administrator should work in unison. The best guarantee for that would be to give the Commander-in-Chief a voice in the selection of the Administrator. But the absurdity of Mr Brodrick's hypothetical objection will be best revealed by an indication of the supreme advantage of the proposal of Lord Roberts. It does not require the advent of the heaven-born genius, but exactly suits the capabilities of the men who are available. The post of Commander-in-Chief, with its present responsibilities slightly curtailed on the administrative side, is what Lord Roberts feels would best suit him. For the office of Administrator-General the right man is there in the person of Sir Henry Brackenbury, who has administered the Indian army on the lines here set forth, and whose magnificent achievement in the supply of the army in South Africa has hardly received the recognition which it deserves. If Mr Brodrick had been willing to be guided by military opinion he would have found that Lord Roberts, in consultation with Sir Henry Brackenbury, would draft in a single day the Order in Council needed to place both the military administration and the command of the army upon a sound footing.

The problem before us is to ascertain how, in the British system, the harmony between policy and strategy may be attained. It has been shown how, by two comparatively simple changes, the necessity for which is based upon the needs of war and the practice of modern armies, and both of which have been consistently advocated by Lord Roberts, the military half of the problem may be solved, and the army, both at its head and in its

* Report, Q. 10,737.

limbs, the army corps, supplied with the means for the cultivation of strategy.

It remains to consider how the proper influence of strategy in the Cabinet may be secured. The most authoritative exponent of the nature of war has expressed himself clearly on this point.*

'None of the main plans which are necessary for a war can be made without insight into the political relations; and people say something quite different from what they really mean when they talk of the harmful influence of policy on the conduct of a war. It is not the influence but the policy which they should blame. If the policy is sound—that is, if it hits the mark—it can affect the war only in its own sense, and only advantageously; and where this influence diverts the war from its purpose the source must be sought in a mistaken policy. . . . To ensure that a war shall answer fully to the intentions of policy, and that the policy shall be suited to the means available for the war, there is, where soldier and statesman are not one and the same person, only one good means, namely, to make the Commander-in-Chief a member of the Cabinet, so that at the critical moments he may take part in its deliberations and decisions.'

There is nothing in the British system to prevent this plan from being adopted. Lord Wolseley has more than once been called to a Cabinet meeting, though, apparently, at the critical moments of 1899 he was not so summoned. No Cabinet really determined on a policy that might lead to conflict with another Power would hesitate to send for its Commander-in-Chief. There is therefore no need for regulations on this point, especially as Lord Roberts is satisfied with the means he now has of approaching the Cabinet, namely, through the Secretary of State and through the Cabinet Committee of Defence. But if these means are to be effectual for the purpose now under consideration, certain changes are indispensable. The minister responsible for foreign policy ought to be a member of the Committee of Defence; for policy and strategy can hardly be harmonised at a Committee at which policy is unrepresented. Perhaps, too, it would be desirable that he should not

* Clausewitz, 'Vom Kriege,' Book VIII, ch. vi B.

hold as a cardinal principle that the desired harmony is unattainable.

Even more important is it that the special duty of the Secretary of State for War, as the link between the Commander-in-Chief and the Cabinet, should be strictly formulated, if need be, by an Act of Parliament, such as that which, in 1863, abolished the Secretary at War and transferred his duties to the Secretary of State for War. But in that case his labours must be lightened. Sir James Stephen's Commission reported in 1887 that

'the powers of the Secretary of State are so great that no single person can be expected to exercise them efficiently, especially when regard is had to the uncertainty of his tenure of office, and his presumable deficiency in special knowledge.'

Sir James Stephen's Commission proposed to relieve the Secretary of State by the appointment of a Master-General of the Ordnance, who should be at the head of all the supply departments, and be independent of the Secretary of State. This proposal was, except for this independence, identical with that made by Sir George Chesney for what has above been called an Administrator-General. It was partly because it would relieve the Secretary of State that Lord Roberts advocated that proposal.*

The measures that would facilitate the necessary accord between policy and strategy have now been explained. They are, first, the recognition of a special responsibility in the Secretary of State for securing the consideration by the Cabinet of the strategical aspect of its policy, and by the Commander-in-Chief of the policy which the army must be prepared to assert; secondly, the restoration of the functions of the Quartermaster-General's office as the department for the assistance of the Commander-in-Chief in the conception and execution of operations; and thirdly, the appointment of a general officer to superintend the whole business of supply.

It remains to consider briefly two suggestions of a very different kind that have been made, not by any

† Report, Q. 10,737.

military mind, but by political reformers of the army. The first is the abolition of the office of Commander-in-Chief. Of this proposal it may be remarked, in the first place, that it ignores the spirit of military institutions, which requires that the authority over the combatant forces should be united in a single hand, though its holder should ever be the obedient servant of the civil government. In war there must be a commander deciding questions of strategy and discipline, and selecting officers for the work they have to do. Not to have such a single authority in peace is to denaturalise the organisation. Even if, in small expeditions, the Commander-in-Chief remains at home, it must be assumed that in a national war, a struggle with one or more great Powers, he will direct the military forces. Secondly, the proposed change cannot be carried out. If the office of Commander-in-Chief were abolished there would still be, under some other name, an officer of pre-eminent influence on the army; but there would be a perpetual struggle for ascendancy between the great heads of departments at the War Office.

The other proposal is to give executive authority to a commission or board. The history of war is a long series of proofs of the incompetence of boards to conduct it. If advice is required, it is to be had only by arrangements such as those above proposed for the proper distribution of duties among the branches of the headquarters staff, and through the consequent growth of specialised professional knowledge and ability. If deliberation is needed, there are the Cabinet and the Committee of Defence, which exist for that purpose. In the War Office itself, the War Office council gives all the needed facility for the establishment of a mutual understanding between the heads of departments. Lord Rosebery, indeed, has made a third proposal—to hand over the whole problem of army organisation to Lord Kitchener. That is equivalent to a declaration that the problem is beyond ordinary human intelligence, and that the 'Superman' should be called in. It cannot be rational, in a matter of public administration, to appeal to the miraculous.

SPENSER WILKINSON.

ART. XII.—RETALIATION AND RECIPROCITY.

1. *Economic Notes on Insular Free Trade.* By the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P. London: Longmans, 1903.
2. *Correspondence between the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., and the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M.P.* 'The Times,' September 18, 1903.
3. *Speech delivered by the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., at Sheffield, Oct. 1, 1903.*
4. *Speeches delivered by the Right Hon. J. Chamberlain, M.P., at Glasgow, Oct. 6, and at Greenock, Oct. 7, 1903.*
5. *Memoranda, Statistical Tables, and Charts prepared in the Board of Trade, with reference to various matters bearing on British and Foreign Trade and Industrial Conditions.* London: Spottiswoode, 1903. [Cd. 1761.]
6. *The Growth and Direction of our Foreign Trade in Coal during the last half-century.* By D. A. Thomas, M.P. (Printed for private circulation.) Statistical Society.
7. *The Tariff Problem.* By Professor W. J. Ashley. London: King & Son, 1903.
8. *Mr Chamberlain's Proposals.* By C. A. Vince. With a preface by the Right Hon. J. Chamberlain, M.P. London: Grant Richards, 1903.
9. *The Great Inquest. An examination of Mr Chamberlain's Fiscal Proposals.* By A. C. Pigou. London: Office of 'The Pilot,' 1903.
10. *Free Trade or Protection. A speech delivered by the Right Hon. H. Hobhouse, M.P., at Castle Cary, on Sept. 10, 1903.* Yeovil: Western Gazette and Co., 1903.

MR BALFOUR has declined to accept either Mr Chamberlain's opinion that reciprocity is necessary to save the empire, or the scheme by which he proposes to establish reciprocal commercial relations within the empire. In rejecting the theory of 'no reciprocity no empire,' Mr Balfour does not deny that reciprocity is desirable if attainable. He simply recognises that Mr Chamberlain's proposals are, for the present, impracticable, and limits his own policy to what he regards as necessary and attainable. His policy is to break down the high tariffs of foreign nations by the weapon of retaliatory duties.

For this he demands 'freedom to negotiate,' and is at once met by Mr Arthur Elliot with the retort that he has this freedom already, and by Mr Bowles with the inquiry whether the freedom asked for means liberty to impose customs duties and to negotiate treaties of commerce without regard to the House of Commons. That power to negotiate exists now the Sugar Convention bears witness; but this form of negotiation is not what Mr Balfour has in view. He more probably has in his mind some such situation as would arise if Germany, for example, in forming a new tariff, were to impose duties that would further injure British trade. To meet such a situation he demands 'freedom to negotiate' by threatening, and, if need be, by immediately enforcing, a retaliatory tariff. And at Sheffield he has made it clear that he wishes to adopt similar measures in order to enforce a reduction of existing tariffs that are believed to be outrageously unfair to British interests. The object would not be to restore a protective system; but, if foreign nations did not surrender to threats, that would necessarily be the result. The new position then is that, whereas Mr Chamberlain's main object is to save the empire, Mr Balfour's is to save trade; and it is conceivable that circumstances might arise in which Mr Balfour, in the absence of colonial reciprocity, would have to turn his weapon even against the protectionist colonies. His hope is, however, that Mr Chamberlain will overcome the popular prejudice against the taxation of food; and he is ready to accept reciprocity as a policy so soon as this obstacle is removed. He would probably have done better for himself in the end, and he would certainly have made his own attitude clearer, and freed his policy from the charge of ambiguity, had he thrown in his lot whole-heartedly with Mr Chamberlain. But he has chosen otherwise: he has deliberately deprived himself of the political arguments—the most plausible side of Mr Chamberlain's case—and has taken his stand on economical grounds alone. On these, then, he must be judged.

The great issue raised by Mr Balfour is, then, not one of old-age pensions, of a big loaf or a little loaf, of high wages or low wages. It is not a question even—though

this is a vital matter—whether the country is or is not enjoying prosperity and, for the present, at least, maintaining its trade. Mr Balfour admits the prosperity. He admits that, on the whole, trade is maintained. But he asserts that dynamic forces have come into operation that have entirely changed the conditions of international competition; and that, unless we meet these new conditions with a policy of retaliation, our trade and prosperity in the world will be destroyed. Here he and Mr Chamberlain occupy the same ground. That conditions have changed everybody knows. The question is whether the new conditions involve the dangers that Mr Balfour and Mr Chamberlain apprehend, and, if so, whether the remedies they propose will avert them.

At the outset of an inquiry into influences that operate upon international trade, it is necessary to remove some misapprehensions respecting coal. The fact is often overlooked that it is indispensable for British shipping. Coal has played an extremely important part in the maintenance of British mercantile supremacy all over the world; and with the growth of steam-shipping its exportation for the use of British shipping, including the navy, has increased. In 1860 the registered steam tonnage owned in the United Kingdom was only 2000 vessels, with an aggregate of 454,327 tons; and the exports of coal and other fuel came to 7,400,000 tons. In 1901 the number of steamers registered was 9484, and their gross tonnage amounted to 12,470,000 tons. Meanwhile, the exportation of coal and fuel had risen to 41,877,000 tons. Steam tonnage had multiplied nearly twenty-eight times, while coal exports had multiplied less than six times. Since 1870 engineering improvements have doubled the effective steam-producing power of coal, which in turn has reduced the cost of carriage by sea and stimulated the over-sea trade, not only of the British empire, but of foreign countries as well. And the great bulk of the over-sea trade, whether of British or foreign origin, is in the hands of the British mercantile marine. More than 70 per cent. of the tonnage employed in the foreign trade to and from ports in the United Kingdom is British; the whole of our coasting trade and 81 per cent. of the over-

sea trade of the colonies is in British hands ; and 36 per cent. of the tonnage entered and cleared at foreign ports is British, notwithstanding the recent increase of German shipping. As showing 'how groundless is the alarm of those who fear that in coal we are exporting the raw material to enable foreign manufacturers to compete with us in home or in neutral markets,' Mr D. A. Thomas, in his paper read before the Royal Statistical Society in May last, remarks that the coal supplied to other countries for manufacturing, other than for steam-raising, does not amount to 4 per cent. of our exports ; and, if further evidence be required,

'It is only necessary to point to the fact that, of those who may be considered our industrial rivals, the United States in 1900 took from us less than 1 per cent. (0·03) of the quantity of coal she consumed, Germany 6·14 per cent., France 16·42 per cent., Russia 12·9 per cent., Belgium 6·04 per cent., Japan 1·99 per cent., and Austria-Hungary 1·08 per cent. True, Spain took 41·57 and Italy 93·56 per cent. of the coal they consumed ; but by no stretch of the imagination can either country be regarded as a serious industrial rival of Great Britain. The great bulk of our export is for the use of steamships ; and it is within the mark to say that over half of our exports are for navigation purposes, and further, that more than half the coal exported is for British consumption abroad.'

The fact is that, as regards the bulk of the coal exported, it is no more for foreign use than if it were employed for steam-raising in Great Britain.

Mr Thomas was also able to show that the area over which British coal is sold is being steadily curtailed. He draws the lines at the Suez Canal on the east, between Cape Horn and the Cape of Good Hope on the south, and Cape Farewell and Trinidad on the west, while in the Baltic and on the north coast of France acute German competition has to be met. In Asiatic and Pacific waters the coal supply has fallen into the hands of New South Wales, British Columbia, India, Japan, and the United States. There need be no undue alarm therefore at the prospect of coal exports increasing ; and, if sales in the Mediterranean become larger, those who wish to see those exports reduced will derive some consolation in British

shipping beyond Suez being supplied from other sources. The dynamic forces in this case are reassuring.

Putting aside coal, then, we have to consider the dynamics of trade and the changes in the conditions of international commerce, in order to ascertain whether the position of a free-trade country in a protectionist world is no longer tenable.

Sixty years ago England was the workshop of the world, and for thirty years after protection was overthrown her industrial supremacy was unchallenged. France had not emerged from revolutions; and, when the empire came, it meant war in Italy and Mexico, and preparation for the war that lost the eastern provinces. Germany as an empire did not exist. Prussia was about to enter upon a series of wars that for the time prevented industrial development. Italy as a nation did not exist; it, too, had to pass through the ordeal of war to national unity. The United States had still to expand from an area of 500,000 square miles to 3,000,000 square miles, and from a population of 23,000,000 to one of 76,000,000. Nowhere in the whole world was any nation in a position to challenge British industrial supremacy. It is argued, indeed, that the conditions were such that, free trade or no free trade, British industry must have been supreme. Superior machinery in the textile trade, the development of steam-power on land and sea, gold discoveries in California and Australia, freedom from serious wars except in the Crimea, tranquillity at home while waves of revolution and devastating wars swept over the Continent, and loans to foreign nations for railway-making, industrial undertakings, and purposes of war—these, it is contended, were causes quite sufficient to account for the rapid development of British commerce between 1846 and 1874 without any reference to free trade. It is even doubted whether free trade lowered the price of wheat. Mr Chamberlain disputes this when (September 16) he writes: 'The price of bread for many years after the corn laws were repealed was higher than the average for five years previously.' The Corn Importation Bill was passed in June 1846, and by it the duty on wheat was reduced to 4s., when imported at or above 53s per quarter, until February 1, 1849. After that date the

duty fell to 1s. per quarter. The average prices for wheat (Board of Trade Blue-book, p. 121) in the five years preceding 1849 and the subsequent five years were:—

	s.	d.
1844	51	3
1845	50	10
1846	54	8
1847	69	9
1848	50	6

Mean price, 55s. 5d.

	s.	d.
1849	44	3
1850	40	3
1851	38	6
1852	40	9
1853	53	3

Mean price, 43s. 5d.

Instead of corn-prices being higher, as Mr Chamberlain says, after the duty was removed, they were, on an average, 12s. per quarter lower. There was a sharp rise, naturally, when the Crimean war came; and it was not until 1858 that the average dropped again. It was not the price of wheat only that fell after the passing of Sir Robert Peel's Act. Its immediate effect was to send down the general level of prices, according to Sauerbeck's Index number, more than 10 per cent.—to the level indeed of the present day; and they remained down until the Crimean war. So much in answer to the assertion that free trade could have had no share in stimulating national prosperity because it failed to produce cheapness of food.

But it is argued that, whatever advantages free trade may or may not have conferred, other nations have, nevertheless, by means of protection, built up industrial systems that now menace British prosperity. Is it to be for one moment supposed, then, that if the world had adopted free trade instead of protection this country would still have remained the workshop of the world, and that every nation would have brought food and raw material here, and have thankfully taken British manufactures in return? Such a condition of things might be possible in an imaginary island, but not in a world in which each nation strives to be self-sufficient, so far as its national resources will permit. Free trade or no free trade, protection or no protection, industries would have grown up in foreign countries. It would have been a physical impossibility for Great Britain to have supplied the manufactures required by continental nations and the United States, in addition to providing exports to all other parts of the world; and the vast

populations of the United States and continental nations could not have existed upon agriculture alone. The growth of competing industries was inevitable. The only differences caused by free trade in the United Kingdom were that, by becoming the open market of the world, food and raw material were secured here at the lowest prices of the world; that the United Kingdom maintained its position as the centre of the world's commerce and finance; and that the creation of competing industries in other nations was rendered more difficult. To establish industries under protection is costly. Heavy import duties are a tax upon the consumers of imported produce. But, where a nation is determined to create industries, cost does not stand in the way. Even in a free-trade world competing industries would have grown up and attained maturity under the fierce competition of established and prosperous British industries. The struggle would have been severe; but, once the foreign competing industries were established, they would have been on an impregnable natural basis, and would have needed neither the machinations of Trusts nor of Kartells to ensure their prosperity. They have grown up under protection and require both.

As national industries grow, whether under free trade or protection, they help to supply, first, the home market, and next, external markets, with the inevitable result of curtailing the demand for foreign produce of a similar kind. During the last thirty years the building up of industries in the United States and Germany has made steady and great progress, especially during the last ten or fifteen years; and the recovery of France since the war with Germany has been marvellous. Wars, except in the Balkans, have for more than thirty years ceased in Europe; and the Spanish-American and Chinese wars scarcely disturbed general commerce. There has been nothing to interrupt the industrial progress of Europe and the United States. With steady industry wealth has increased, and the need for loans from Great Britain has declined, except in the Colonies, India, the Argentine Republic, Japan, and other non-competitive nations. The stimulus that huge loans in one form or other gave to trade with the United States in the earlier days of free trade has ceased; and American financiers have even

begun to subscribe to British loans and to invest in the home industries of Great Britain. Continental financiers, too, became large creditors of this country during the heavy expenditure on the South African war. British loans to foreign governments, which had reached a total of over 24,000,000*l.* in the year before the Boer war, declined during the war until, in 1901, they did not reach 1,000,000*l.* The colonies, however, borrowed so freely that their loans in 1901 exceeded 16,000,000*l.*, with corresponding stimulus to colonial trade.

Nevertheless it almost seemed as though the financial movements that were in operation might shake the proud position of London as the financial centre of the world and produce a revolutionary and disastrous effect upon British commerce. Instead of the surplus value of British imports over exports being covered by interest charges upon foreign loans and investments, and the earnings of British shipping, American railroad and other securities formerly held here were sold and shipped to New York; the Shipping Trust, the Tobacco Trust, along with Mr Yerkes and other enterprising Americans, began operations here; and subsidised foreign shipping began to challenge British supremacy at sea. It looked almost as though we were beginning to live upon our capital, and were approaching a period when, instead of receiving from abroad millions of pounds' worth of imports in liquidation of interest upon loans and other external indebtedness, we should have to export more than we imported to pay interest charges upon American capital invested here. Mr Balfour, however, finds no evidence that we are living upon capital; and the forty-sixth Report of the Inland Revenue Commissioners shows that the taxed income from external investments has risen from an average annual value of 50,000,000*l.* in the five years ended March 31, 1891, to 62,560,000*l.* in the fiscal year 1901-2. If American securities have been sold, the capital has been placed more remuneratively elsewhere.

These, then, are some of the changed conditions that have to be considered. With seventy millions of Americans, and over one hundred millions of Germans, French, Belgians, and Dutch, not only supplying their own wants over a large field of industry that was formerly exclusively

our own, but invading colonial and other markets also, and with foreigners becoming lenders to this country instead of borrowers, it is little wonder that the rate of progress in the exports of British manufacturers to America and the continental industrial nations should show a diminishing rate of progress. The marvel is that it should show progress at all. In the colonies, even in the protected colonies, other conditions still prevail. There protected industries are yet in their infancy; the colonies are still borrowers on a large scale; and, in Canada especially, the development of natural resources is proceeding at an unprecedented rate of progression. It is as natural that our trade with the colonies should, in such circumstances, show steady increase, as that its progress in relation to competing nations should suffer a check or even be reversed.

If these are the kinetics, what are the statics of the position? It is not only in Great Britain that conditions are changed. Our most formidable competitors are Germany and the United States. What the future of Germany may be cannot well be foreseen; but the conflict between the Agrarian and the Socialist parties is severe; the policy pursued by the Kartells is found to injure German industries that are not protected by rings; and the standard of wages and length of the German working-day have yet to be seriously considered and readjusted to the average conditions of competing countries. The United States has enjoyed conditions that are passing away. A vast network of railroads has been constructed there, largely with British capital. Vacant cultivable lands have almost been filled up; and virgin soil does not, under cultivation, for ever retain its fertility. Emigration from Europe still sets strongly towards the States, but there are at least signs of migration on a large scale from the comparatively unproductive American North-west to the fertile prairie land of Canada. If every immigrant entering the United States represents in rearing and education, technical skill, and cash in hand, an average capital of only 100*l.*, the accretion of wealth through the influx of immigrants within the last ten years has amounted on an average to over 34,000,000*l.* per annum. And this has been going on for half a century. As the country fills up, as the prairie lands decline in fertility and begin to demand manure,

and as industrialism more and more increases and is driven into competition beyond the sea, the tide of immigration will tend to diminish; workers will have to be reared and educated at home; and the conditions of competition with foreign nations will approximate more nearly to those prevailing in Europe. The American, like the German industrial world, has its own special problems to face. Dr W. Cunningham, who shares Mr Balfour's desire to promote free trade by retaliatory tariffs, touches a tender spot in American industrialism when, in his paper read at the meeting of the British Association at Southport, he says:—

'The seventeen millions of Anglo-Saxon descent are the organisers of industry, and the sixty millions of negroes and dagoes and others retain a monopoly of manual drudgery. It is not wholly in jest that the cultured American speculates as to "when the beast is going to rear." If a vigorous agitation against the protected interests were begun by the wheat-growers, it is not unlikely that a large number of dissatisfied labourers would rally to the cry, and that the artificial system which has been built up would collapse. Under these circumstances I hold that we may be well advised in initiating the attack.'

If, then, British manufacturers have been and are being hard pressed by American and German competition, and if there be some grounds on which they may regard the future with anxiety, other nations also have problems ahead that are, to say the least, quite as perplexing and menacing as any with which this country is confronted. The dynamic forces are not all telling in the same direction. There is, however, another and very insidious force in operation to which has been given the name of 'dumping.' Consideration of it may be conveniently deferred until after a general examination of the actual statistical position.

The actual effect of high tariffs and other influences upon the course of trade can seldom be distinctly traced; but there are broad movements, the general significance of which can scarcely be misunderstood. The past thirty years fall into three distinct periods, each of which has characteristics of its own. In the first, the dominant features were the demonetisation of silver in 1873, heavy

commercial failures in 1875, the ruinous fall that began in the price of silver in 1876, the Russo-Turkish war and the Indian famine in 1877, the stoppage of the City of Glasgow Bank in 1878, and between 1873 and 1878 a general decline in prices of about 20 per cent. Our trade suffered severely in this period, both in imports and exports, especially in the latter; but the fall is not attributable to high tariffs or dumping, for these did not then exist. The values of British imports and exports, in millions of pounds sterling, were:—

YEAR.	IMPORTS.		EXPORTS.	
	Manufactures.	Other Products.	Manufactures.	Other Products.
1873 . . .	66·8	304·2	228·9	26·1
1874 . . .	72·7	297·3	214·4	25·6
1875 . . .	72·7	301·3	201·2	21·8
1876 . . .	76·1	298·9	179·5	21·5
1877 . . .	80·6	313·4	178·3	20·7
1878 . . .	75·1	293·9	173·0	20·0

Under the demoralisation caused by the demonetisation of silver, imports of manufactured goods increased rapidly in value; and, when allowance is made for the fall in prices, the increase in volume was 50 per cent., down to the time when the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank gave business a sharp check. It is here, and in succeeding years down to 1885-6, and not in recent years, that Mr Chamberlain may find that large increase in the importation of foreign manufactures which so alarms him, but which he has failed to discover because it is concealed by the heavy fall in prices. Other imports simply see-sawed round about three hundred millions. Exports of both manufactured goods and other produce declined in value by one fourth, so that, when allowance is made for the fall in prices, they showed an actual decline in volume as well as in value. But there is no reason to suppose that our trade went elsewhere: the exports of France, Belgium, and Holland, in the same period, fell away enormously too.

In the second period, the most important dominating events were: in 1879, the German tariff raised to protectionist level, and the Victorian and Canadian tariffs increased; in 1881-2, 1884-5, and 1887, the Russian tariff

increased; in 1885, further increase in the German tariff; in 1886, great trade depression and riots of unemployed; in 1878-87, decline of about 12 per cent. in the general level of prices. In this period the values of British imports and exports in millions of pounds were:—

YEAR.	IMPORTS.		EXPORTS.	
	Manufactures.	Other Produce.	Manufactures.	Other Produce.
1879 . . .	70·4	292·6	170·3	21·7
1880 . . .	83·2	327·8	198·2	24·8
1881 . . .	78·8	318·2	209·1	24·9
1882 . . .	84·1	328·9	214·9	27·1
1883 . . .	84·9	342·1	213·3	26·7
1884 . . .	82·9	307·1	206·3	26·7
1885 . . .	83·4	287·6	188·1	24·9
1886 . . .	81·4	268·6	188·1	24·9
1887 . . .	82·4	270·6	196·2	25·8
1888 . . .	93·2	294·8	206·1	27·9
1889 . . .	100·8	320·2	218·3	30·7

The conspicuous feature in the trade of this period is, however, that, notwithstanding the advances in the German and Russian tariffs, there was a marked recovery in 1880 in the exportation of manufactured goods; and this continued until 1884. Then it was checked for two years by the further advance of the German tariff and the renewed serious decline in prices, but recovered again in 1887, and continued to make progress until 1889. In that year we had, in fact, reached the same value-level of exports of manufactured products as in 1873-4, though meanwhile prices had fallen one third. Our exports of 'other produce' too, it will be seen, followed in this period the same upward and downward movements as 'manufactures'; and our imports, with less uniformity, followed substantially the same lines.

To appreciate the significance of these facts, it is necessary to compare the German figures for the same period with ours. (See table on next page.)

Taken together, the German and British figures show that in both countries the upward and downward movements occurred practically at the same time, and happened to start from the years in which the German tariff was increased. The comparative steadiness of prices from 1880 to 1883 enabled trade to prosper. The rapid decline in prices that then occurred depressed trade in both

GERMAN IMPORTS AND EXPORTS 1880-1890 IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS.

YEAR.	IMPORTS.		EXPORTS.	
	Manufactures.	Other Produce.	Manufactures.	Other Produce.
1880 . . .	39.1	101.9	83.5	61.3
1881 . . .	41.5	106.7	87.6	61.3
1882 . . .	43.4	113.1	94.1	65.4
1883 . . .	46.1	117.1	98.1	65.5
1884 . . .	45.8	117.2	100.6	59.6
1885 . . .	42.0	105.2	90.0	53.0
1886 . . .	42.4	102.0	97.2	52.1
1887 . . .	41.6	114.6	102.4	54.4
1888 . . .	43.8	120.7	103.7	56.6
1889 . . .	49.6	151.2	104.9	53.4
1890 . . .	49.0	159.0	107.3	59.1

countries. So far as can be seen, it was movements in values and not tariff changes that were the dominating influences in both countries. But, if the high German tariffs had any real effect, they depressed German more than British trade.

The third period is more complicated, and many conflicting influences appear. The chief of these were: in 1892, French tariff raised generally, but reduced in iron and machinery, German tariff rates reduced by German treaties with Austria-Hungary, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland; in 1893-4, Russo-German tariff war; in 1893-5, Franco-Swiss tariff war; in 1894, in the United States the McKinley tariff rates reduced by the Wilson tariff; in 1895, Belgian duties on manufactures reduced; in 1896-7, Indian famine; in 1897, duties in the United States raised by the Dingley tariff; in 1900, Indian famine; in 1899-1902, South African war; in 1894-1902, new methods of competition developed in Kartells and Trusts. Now almost all these influences were antagonistic to British trade, and, speaking generally, favourable to either Germany or the United States; and it is within this period that those symptoms of decay (if there be such symptoms) are to be found upon which the demand for retaliation rests. Prices in this period had not fluctuated violently. From 1891 till 1895 there was a decline of 6 or 7 per cent., which was recovered by 1900; but the improvement was not quite maintained, and values in 1901 and 1902 were about 2 per cent. lower than in 1890-1891.

Mr Balfour's statistics show that the value of British exports (excluding coal, machinery, and ships) to pro-

tected countries between 1880 and 1902 declined from 87,124,000*l.* to 76,667,000*l.*, while to the protected colonies (Australia and Canada) they increased from 11,498,000*l.* to 14,859,000*l.*, to all other countries and colonies from 106,801,000*l.* to 139,000,000*l.*, and to India from 29,278,000*l.* to 29,742,000*l.* The conspicuous feature is the decline in the exports to foreign protected countries, while exports to all the rest of the world, even to the protected colonies, have increased. More detailed than Mr Balfour's figures are the statistics respecting exports and imports of manufactured and partly manufactured products given in the Board of Trade Blue-book of information supplied to the Cabinet. For obvious reasons, a comparison of the statistics of any single year with another single year is not to be trusted. The official return covers thirteen years ending with 1902. Taking the last twelve years in periods of four years each, the remarkable fact is revealed that our exports of manufactures to Germany increased 24·3 per cent., and to Russia no less than 47 per cent., while to the self-governing colonies the increase was 42 per cent., and to unprotected foreign countries only 12 per cent. The detailed statistics are as follow :—

AVERAGE ANNUAL VALUE OF EXPORTS OF BRITISH MANUFACTURED AND PARTLY MANUFACTURED PRODUCE (excluding Food, Drink and Tobacco, and Ships), 1891 TO 1902, IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS.

EXPORTS TO	1891-4.	1895-8.	1899-1902.	Increase or Decrease % of 1899-1902 over 1891-94.
				£ per cent.
Russia	4·9	6·4	7·2	+ 2,300,000 = 47
Germany	14·8	18·4	18·4	+ 3,600,000 = 24·3
Holland	8·3	7·7	7·7	- 600,000 = 7
Germany and Holland .	23·1	26·1	26·1	+ 3,000,000 = 13
Belgium	6·5	7·1	7·7	+ 1,200,000 = 18
France	10·9	10·5	10·7	- 200,000 = 2
Italy	3·4	3·4	3·8	+ 400,000 = 12
United States	21·6	18·3	16·6	- 5,000,000 = 23
Other foreign countries	55·5	56·9	62·2	+ 6,700,000 = 12
India	27·9	26·9	30·7	+ 2,800,000 = 10
Self-governing Colonies	31·0	34·8	44·0	+ 13,000,000 = 42
Other Colonies	10·3	10·4	13·0	+ 2,700,000 = 26
Total	195·4	200·9	221·9	+ 26,500,000 = 13·5

With such varying results as these, in both protected and unprotected areas, it is unscientific and wholly misleading to lump together all protected countries in one class and all unprotected countries in another, and, upon

a mere comparison of general results, to jump to conclusions. How can it be broadly asserted that British manufactures are being barred out of protected countries by tariffs when what is lost in the United States is more than covered by gains in Germany and Russia, and when the actual increase in the value of manufactures exported to the two last-named countries falls short by only 800,000*l.* of the increase in the exports to all the non-protected foreign countries in the world?

The explanation of these variations must be looked for in some other direction than high tariffs. The statistics for France and Holland suggest that it is in those countries that the consumption of British manufactures is declining. In the case of Holland it may be that the decrease is more apparent than real. Taking Germany and Holland together, the aggregate annual value of the imports in the period 1891-4 was 23,100,000*l.*, in 1895-9, 26,100,000*l.*, and in 1899-1902, 26,100,000*l.*; and the rate of improvement 13 per cent., which is 1 per cent. above the rate in unprotected foreign countries. The only certain deductions from the statistics are that the export trade to the United States is in an unsatisfactory condition; and that, contrary to what Mr Chamberlain says, our exports of manufactured goods to every protected area in Europe, except France, are increasing. That practically the whole of the increase took place before the Boer war began, and that there has been an increase of only 2,000,000*l.* since, indicates that the war, and not high tariffs, checked our continental trade. We know that during the war all British workshops and workmen were employed and were still unable to supply our own needs.

Turning to the imports of manufactured goods from competing countries, and comparing them with our exports, it is found that the only protected countries in regard to which our exports exceed our imports are Russia, Germany, and Italy; that our imports from Germany, Belgium, and France—especially from Belgium—have in recent years shown a large advance; but that it is the United States more than any other nation that is increasing its sales of manufactured and partly manufactured goods in this country.

AVERAGE VALUE OF IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURED AND PARTLY MANUFACTURED PRODUCE FROM PROTECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES (excluding Food, Drink, and Tobacco), 1891-1902, IN THOUSANDS OF POUNDS.

IMPORTS FROM	1891-4.	1896-8.	1899-1902.	Increase or Decrease % of 1899-1902 over 1891-94.
Russia	2,550	3,060	3,070	+ 20·4
Germany	9,877	11,536	14,256	+ 44·3
Holland	16,561	16,254	17,785	+ 7·4
Germany and Holland .	26,438	27,790	32,041	+ 21·1
Belgium	12,357	14,615	18,266	+ 47·9
France	24,778	30,683	30,862	+ 24·5
Italy	1,912	1,799	1,860	- 2·7
United States	10,769	14,006	20,390	+ 90·0

Here, as in the case of exports to Germany and Holland, it seems prudent to treat these two countries together; and, in that case, imports from Germany and Holland and Russia are shown to be about equally progressive, those from France slightly more so, while those from Belgium—a country whose tariff approximates to free trade—are advancing by ‘leaps and bounds,’ though not at the prodigious rate of the United States. That our exports of manufactured goods to the whole of protected Europe in 1891-94 fell short of our imports by 19,300,000*l.*, and that this adverse balance in 1899-1902 had risen to 30,700,000*l.* is perfectly true; but the trade with Belgium and France accounts for practically the whole of the increase, as will be seen from the following figures:—

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURES IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS,
1891-94 AND 1899-1902.

	Russia.	Italy.	Germany and Holland.	Belgium.	France.
1891-4.					
Imports	2·6	1·9	26·4	12·4	24·8
Exports	4·9	3·4	23·1	6·5	10·9
Bal. Cr.	2·3	1·5			
„ Dr.			3·3	5·9	13·9
1899-1902.					
Imports	3·1	1·9	32·0	18·3	30·9
Exports	7·2	3·8	26·1	7·7	10·7
Bal. Cr.	4·1	1·9			
„ Dr.			5·9	10·6	20·2

The adverse balance with Germany is covered by the favourable balances with Russia and Italy in both periods; but, so long as trade with all foreign countries is looked at in the lump, these features of it cannot be observed. It is not the German and Dutch, but the Belgian and French trades that need investigation. But still more do the statistics of trade with the United States demand attention.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURES TO AND FROM THE UNITED STATES, 1891-94 AND 1899-1902, IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS.

	1891-94.	1899-1902.
Imports	10·8	20·1
Exports	21·6	16·6
Balance Cr.	10·8	3·5

There is nothing in the statistics of the trade with protected Europe to compare with this conversion of a credit balance of 10,800,000*l.* into a debit balance of 3,500,000*l.* American sales of manufactured goods in Great Britain have nearly doubled, while British sales in America have fallen off nearly one fourth. It is not the condition of the export trade so much as the rapid growth of the value of imported manufactured and partly manufactured goods that gives legitimate ground, if not for alarm, at least for thorough inquiry.

Another important fact is that two potent influences, to neither of which Mr Balfour and Mr Chamberlain have paid attention, have been in operation during the last four years. Beginning with 1899, shipping entered upon a period of unprecedented prosperity, which reached its maximum in 1900, but continued into the following year. If the normal income from shipping employed in the foreign trade, including the trade of the colonies with foreign countries, and that of foreign countries with each other, be, as is estimated by the Board of Trade, about 90,000,000*l.* per annum, it would certainly be double that amount in 1900, and much above it in 1899 and 1901. Of the tonnage employed in the foreign trade of Germany in 1900, British ships represented 26·9 per cent., in that of Belgium 44·6 per cent., of Holland 41·7 per cent., of France 40·6 per cent., and of the United States 52·8 per cent. During the period of high freights consequent on the

South African war, the indebtedness of those countries to Great Britain for shipping services must have been on an unprecedented scale, and would naturally exercise a direct stimulating effect upon their exports to this country. In the case of the United States, the large exportation of American securities to New York, paid for by imports of American produce, and American investments here, coming in the form not of bullion but of merchandise, would have a similar stimulating influence; though the ultimate effect would be to cause exports to be sent in payment of interest. If the proceeds of some of the securities that were sold to New York were invested in Europe, that, too, would help to stimulate continental exports to this country. These are influences that, though less visible, are quite as powerful in their effects as tariffs, and must be allowed for in considering the mere statistical position.

But, should the broad features of our trade with Europe and America give no support to the demand for retaliation, an examination of the movements in particular trades reveals tendencies that account for the popular outcry against 'dumping.'

Details of imports from Germany show that the largest advances have been in cotton and woollen goods, glass and glass wares, and iron and steel. From Holland, woollens show some increase; but the great movement has been in the importation, within the last three years, of unwrought steel and machinery. Imports from Belgium also show a general advance in glass, an increase in the imports of cotton goods since 1896—the year following a reduction in Belgian duties on manufactured goods—and, during the last three years, a decided increase in iron and steel. All these countries, however, and France, show a general increase in their exportation to this country of the miscellaneous products of small industries that are in no way affected by dumping. The signs of dumping are practically limited to the iron and steel trades. The same remark applies to the United States; but the large advance in the American importation into this country of copper and unenumerated iron and steel manufactures began in 1896, and made another jump in 1898, while dumping from the Continent did not begin until the collapse in Germany

three years ago. The first American movement followed upon the general reduction of duties by the Wilson tariff in 1894, and the second upon the heavy increase in duties by the Dingley tariff in 1897. The actual movement will be seen at a glance from the following figures of exports to the United Kingdom from the United States since 1895:—

EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Year.	Unwrought and part wrought Copper.	Iron and Steel manufactures unenumerated.
	Thousands £.	Thousands £.
1895. . . .	539	504
1896. . . .	1,542	1,592
1897. . . .	1,475	2,422
1898. . . .	2,058	3,239
1899. . . .	1,535	3,808
1900. . . .	2,122	3,560
1901. . . .	1,361	3,370
1902. . . .	2,286	3,544

The rise in values in 1896 and 1898 is very striking; but the facts that the increase of two millions in 1896 followed a lowering of the McKinley tariff, and that the advance that began in 1898 followed an advance in the tariff, suggest that some influence more powerful than the tariff was in operation. The movement in the importation of unenumerated iron and steel manufactures from Belgium, Holland, and Germany in the last four years is indicative of the effect of German dumping.

IMPORTS FROM GERMANY, HOLLAND, AND BELGIUM OF UNENUMERATED IRON AND STEEL MANUFACTURES.

1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.
£2,087,732	£2,438,404	£3,185,100	£3,512,044

Whatever may be the solution of the American problem, German dumping differs in character from the American. A sudden check to abnormal prosperity in Germany found the iron and steel trades with heavy stocks for which there was no home demand; and these were 'dumped' indiscriminately into protectionist and free trade countries—Belgium, Great Britain, the United States, and Canada—at the best prices that could be obtained. The effect was much the same as that of the sale of a bankrupt's stock, and was soon over. The other system of dumping

is more insidious in its results, and exists in Germany as well as in America. Notwithstanding the unexplained fact that both a reduction and an increase of the American tariff have been followed by increased exportation, it is a high tariff linked with trade combination that makes dumping possible. The well-known method of German Kartells and American Trusts is to keep their works running, to fix the home price of their products at a level that, under their tariff, just suffices to keep foreign competitors out; and to sell abroad the output that is not required at home at whatever 'cut prices' the conditions of trade in the respective foreign markets render necessary. Evidently this system might, in certain circumstances, not only keep foreigners out of Germany and America, but ruin foreign producers in their own market; and this is the main consideration upon which Mr Chamberlain and Mr Balfour demand power to retaliate. Mr Balfour, in his pamphlet, admits that 'the power of underselling will last no longer than the ring whose monopoly has made it possible,' and that 'in some trades, though only in some, there is nothing so evanescent as these commercial conspiracies'; but he fears that, however short-lived they may be, they may last long enough to destroy a valuable asset; and that, if the business attacked survives at all, 'it will only be by slow and laborious stages' that it will reconquer its position. Mr Balfour does not point to any ruined industry to enforce his argument. On the other hand, the condition of the British iron and steel trades, as reflected in the export trade, can scarcely be said to be alarming. Under the influence of American and German dumping our exports of machinery, and of iron and steel manufactures of all kinds, have shown a marked increase.

EXPORTS OF MACHINERY AND OF IRON AND STEEL MANUFACTURES
SINCE 1894, IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS.

Year.	Machinery.	Manufactures.	Total.
1894	13·4	16·5	29·9
1895	14·3	17·4	31·7
1896	16·1	20·9	37·0
1897	15·2	21·5	36·7
1898	17·3	19·7	37·0
1899	18·4	22·9	41·3
1900	18·2	25·5	43·7
1901	16·2	22·4	38·6

The effects of the Wilson tariff and of the Dingley tariff, and of the more recent spasmodic dumping from Germany, seem to be as conspicuously evident in the advances made in British exports in 1896, 1899, and 1900 as in the German and American returns. The check in 1901 was due to the sudden falling away of the continental demand; and with the recovery of purchasing power on the Continent the lost ground will no doubt be recovered. At all events, the iron and steel trade with Germany and the United States, since dumping became serious, has left little to be desired; for, though the effect of the Dingley Act, both immediately before and after it was passed, was bad, the recovery in exports to the United States has been more than complete; and the American tariff has had no prejudicial effect upon our trade with Germany.

EXPORTS OF MACHINERY, INCLUDING STEAM ENGINES AND IRON AND STEEL MANUFACTURES, TO GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1894, IN THOUSANDS OF POUNDS.

Year.	Germany.	United States.
1894	2,688	980
1895	2,714	1,260
1896	3,490	1,322
1897	3,589	823
1898	3,861	954
1899	4,942	1,336
1900	4,963	1,744
1901	2,787	1,510
1902	2,397	3,513

Exports of machinery and iron and steel manufactures to Belgium, Holland, France, Russia, and Italy, have in all cases moved in the same lines as those to America and Germany; and it has to be remembered, too, that a very substantial portion of business of this kind is carried on with the colonies. Since 1894 the total British exports to the colonies of machinery and iron and steel manufactures, in millions of pounds sterling, have been:—

1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.
4·7	5·6	7·7	7·4	6·7	7·5	9·0	9·2	11·9

The recent German dumping, far from having reduced exports to the colonies, where purchasing power was not checked by mercantile collapse, has had a strongly stimu-

lating effect; and the same result is at least suggested by the exports to the United States in 1902.

Experts of wide experience and high repute have given conflicting opinions as to the economic effects of dumping upon general trade. So far as can be gathered from statistics, its effect seems to be beneficial rather than otherwise. This appears to be specially true of the iron trade. The income tax assessments on ironworks are made on the basis of the profits of the preceding year; and the following figures represent, in millions sterling, the gross profits assessed in the ten years ending March 31, 1902:—

1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.
2·09	1·83	1·83	1·93	1·84	2·56	3·01	3·21	5·38	6·60

The passing of the Dingley tariff synchronised with an advance of 720,000*l.* in profits; and German dumping has brought up the gross profits from under 3,000,000*l.* to 6,600,000*l.* It has yet to be shown that any such emergency has arisen as would on political, as distinguished from economic, grounds, justify a policy of retaliation. It has not even been shown that the American Steel Trust can hold its ground in a period of dull trade, or that it can pursue a dumping policy when the profits from its home market fall away. A drop of 30 per cent. in pig-iron prices, and a diminution of the orders on its books by 1,000,000 tons as compared with this time last year, are even now putting a severe test upon its power.

Mr Balfour finds 'a utilitarian as well as a sentimental objection' to permitting foreign goods to be sold here at less than British prices. There is a still stronger objection, by no means sentimental, to creating a system under which British prices would be artificially raised for the special purpose of enabling our manufacturers to sell at little profit, or at actual loss, to foreign nations. Even with a high tariff our manufacturers would still be at the disadvantage of having a home market of only 42,000,000, while the American home market numbers 76,000,000, and the German 56,000,000, so that the smaller population here would have relatively a heavier burden to bear, in the form of increased prices, than either Americans or Germans. The fact is that Trusts and Kartells and dumping do more harm to the countries in which they are tolerated than to those dumped upon. The evils of high tariffs and

dumping are admirably summarised by Mr Consul-general Francis Oppenheimer in his latest report from Frankfort-on-the-Main ('Annual Series of Diplomatic and Consular Reports,' No. 3042), who makes the following pregnant observations:—

'The difference of prices fixed by the same works for sales at home and sales abroad became so great that it produced very strong comments even in the Diet. Among all the syndicates, those controlling raw material and half-finished goods proved themselves the most powerful and the hardest masters. They sold raw material and half-finished goods abroad at low prices, so that the home industries which worked off such raw materials, etc., were severely handicapped. These asserted (and not without reason) that the consumers of German material in foreign countries, especially in Holland and Belgium, were by these prices placed in such an advantageous position that it was most difficult, if at all possible, to compete against their prices. The syndicates themselves admitted the seriousness of the position by expressing their willingness to grant certain export bonuses, which, however, the industries concerned pronounced inadequate. Some cases actually transpired in which German "finishing" manufacturers had to decline orders owing to the exorbitant prices of raw material, which orders subsequently passed to Holland, Belgium, and the United Kingdom.' (Cd. 1386—119, p. 8.)

Such is the German side of Kartells and dumping. Mr Oppenheimer's description of it cannot commend it for adoption here. Neither on economic nor on political grounds could such a policy be defended, unless it were shown to be the last desperate effort to save threatened national industries from ruin. Wisdom suggests that we should let well alone; but this does not necessarily mean that the admitted evil results of the operations of Kartells and Trusts should be tolerated without any attempt to find a remedy. Only the remedy must not be a revolution in our fiscal system that would bring more and greater evils than it would cure.

Mr Ritchie censures the Government for failing to institute a thorough enquiry into Mr Chamberlain's proposals, and says that the statistics in the special Blue-book 'have never been submitted to any person, or body of persons, to see what the trend of these figures is.'

We have endeavoured to remedy this defect; and the broad conclusions which we draw from a review of trade during the last thirty years are that—

1. From 1873 to 1885 the dominating influence upon trade was the fall in prices caused by the demonetisation of silver; and it was then that the importation of manufactured goods largely increased.
2. Since 1885–86 British exports in general have increased 30 per cent.
3. During the last twelve years our exports of manufactures to Germany, Holland, and Belgium increased by 4,000,000*l.*; but progress was checked by the Boer war. Then exports practically stood still; and imports increased twice as rapidly as before.
4. Hostile tariffs, except in America, have had no perceptible effect upon the general course of British trade.
5. Kartells and Trusts, in the countries in which they exist, injure dependent industries and assist foreign competitors by selling more cheaply abroad than at home.

Such is the situation with which any new policy must deal; and it is upon its applicability to this situation that it must be judged. It is not one in which all protected countries can be lumped together and dealt with in precisely the same way. There is, on the one hand, protection pure and simple; on the other, protection plus ‘rings.’ German experience in the eighties was that high tariffs were ineffective; and even the Dingley tariff has failed, on the whole, to create a close preserve. Still, the experience of America has shown that, if only the tariff be high enough, it will, in particular trades, keep out foreign goods. Bradford supplies a case in point. No sooner did the Dingley tariff come into operation than the export of Bradford worsted coatings to America dropped from an average of over 1,000,000*l.* in the preceding three years to about 70,000*l.* in the following three years. This, then, seems to be one of those cases of ‘outrageous unfairness’ that Mr Balfour at Sheffield said would justify retaliation; and it is just such a case as Mr Chamberlain is ‘not going

to take lying down.' But Mr Balfour prudently limited his retaliation to cases in which hostile action would not hurt ourselves. Now the Dingley tariff not only shut Bradford out of the States, but continental competitors too; and yet, under its 'protection,' the woollen trade in the United States declined so much that the consumption of wool in America, which amounted to 601,000,000 lbs in 1897, fell in 1898 to 397,000,000 lbs, and in 1899 to 335,000,000 lbs; while in England, in spite of Bradford's loss, it increased from 495,000,000 lbs in 1897, to 568,000,000 lbs in 1898, and for the last five years has been on a higher scale than ever before. The Dingley tariff advanced prices so much in the States that the people could not afford to buy; and the home manufacturer was injured as well as the foreigner. Blind retaliation will not do. We must not, in hitting other nations, injure our home trade, and cut ourselves out of foreign trade as the American woollen manufactures are cut out. Trusts have not saved them.

Here Mr Chamberlain comes in with his theory that we must turn to the colonies to find a safe market, and one that will continue to increase; and that to secure it we must bar foreign manufacturers from the empire. If our free import system be a failure, and if we are to reverse and annul, as Mr Balfour said at Sheffield, our policy of taxing for revenue only, and substitute for it the policy of taxing for protection; and if, as Mr Chamberlain says, it is to the colonies only that we can look for salvation; then we have no alternative but to accept the colonial proposals whatever they may be. The existence of the empire and the maintenance of trade would, in such circumstances, both be involved; and the imperative policy would be to protect the home market to the utmost of our power, and to widen it to the largest possible extent, by bringing into it every British colony and possession. This would necessarily involve the taxation of food; and, as the surest method of enlarging the home market would be to restore a rural population, agriculture, still our greatest interest, would stand first amongst the claimants for protection. To stimulate food-production in the colonies, by taxing foreign food and admitting colonial-grown food free, might be prejudicial to home agriculture; but the superior

claims of empire would have to be recognised if the policy were the empire against the world. If this position be accepted—and in putting it forward Mr Chamberlain is logical and thorough—nothing but a complete return to protection will save the home trade and the empire.

Our review of the past thirty years gives no support to Mr Chamberlain's premises, and he has yet to demonstrate their truth. His policy is to smite the foreigner, especially the German, who, as we have seen, along with the Russian, has increased his purchases of British manufactures in recent years to such an extent as to compensate for the loss through the decline in exports to the States. Yes, argues Mr Chamberlain, but our exports to Germany consist too largely of half-manufactured goods that yield little profit; it is finished products that give full employment to British labour and constitute the most profitable trade. If so, the German trade with this country cannot be profitable to Germany, for it is half-manufactured produce that they dump here, to the injury of their own finishing trades. But in this respect Mr Balfour's position is exactly the reverse of Mr Chamberlain's. He objects to the exportation of ships and machinery—the most highly-finished products of British trade—because they help the foreigner in competition with this country; and he would discourage the exportation of any British manufacture that would help the foreigner, though he does not go so far as to say he would do so by imposing export duties. If, then, Mr Balfour would restrict the exportation of this class of products, he ought to welcome such products from abroad, because they would help us in competition with the foreigner. Taking Mr Balfour and Mr Chamberlain together, then, we should discourage the exportation of both half-manufactured and highly finished goods, and welcome both classes of manufactures from abroad, and our trade would be reduced to imports alone.

In this complex situation how does the policy put forward by Mr Balfour at Sheffield apply? To begin with, he says he has no hope of breaking down protection either in foreign countries or the colonies. He has 'no cure.' A general tariff war 'would involve far too great a disturbance to our habits, our practice, and our trade.' His definite proposal is that,

'If we thought we could do it without disadvantage to ourselves—which after all is the guiding policy in these matters—we might inform any foreign country which we thought was treating us with outrageous unfairness that, unless they modified their policy to our advantage, we should feel ourselves compelled to take this or that step in regard to their exports to our country.' ('Times,' October 2.)

This, then, is the ground-plan of Mr Balfour's scheme of retaliation. It must not involve disadvantage to ourselves. It must only be directed against outrageous unfairness. It must not involve a general tariff war. It is not expected to break down protective systems abroad. This is neither a strong nor a hopeful ground-work. It is weak to feebleness or futility, and, to be crowned with any measure of success, would have to be carried far beyond anything Mr Balfour has in view. But, taking it as it stands, who is to decide whether, in any particular case, action can be taken without disadvantage to ourselves? This is a point that experts find it impossible to agree upon, and it is a vital point. In considering it, the interests of both producers and consumers, the export and the import trades, have to be weighed; and no one can pronounce a verdict off-hand.

If a retaliatory policy is to be applied with effect, Mr Balfour's timorous limitations would soon be brushed aside; and, deprecate it as he might, he would find himself not only launched into an all-round protective policy, but forced onwards by irresistible influences to a tariff as high as those he desires to bring down; while, on the side of both labour and capital, increasing clamour would arise. The first retaliatory duties would be like the letting out of water. It would create new grievances and new difficulties; and every attempt at cure would produce more. The general tariff war that he declines to provoke, because it would 'involve too great a disturbance to our habits, our practice, and our trade,' would come upon him; and, by taxing for other than revenue purposes, he would have removed for ever the only barrier between protection and free trade.

The next point is not less important. Who is to determine what constitutes 'outrageous unfairness'? Mr Balfour does not explain; nor does he state whether, when he says, 'their exports to our country,' he means

that a retaliatory duty would be placed indiscriminately upon all an offending foreign country's exports to this country, or only upon specific articles; and, if only upon specific articles, by what method those articles would be selected. If Parliament is to determine these matters, there is no need for organic change. Ministers can submit definite proposals to the House of Commons; and, as in the case of a special war-grant or other emergency, a policy having the whole force of the nation behind it can be sanctioned, if need be, without delay. If interested trades are to determine when they are suffering 'outrageous unfairness,' it is to be feared that there is scarcely a trade or industry in the country that could not, with a good conscience, approach the Government with a plea for protection in some form or other; and if one branch of industry is declared to be entitled to protection, there can be no logical stopping-place. Mr Chamberlain has informed a working-man correspondent that, in his opinion, the production of goods abroad under 'unfair conditions' would constitute a case for retaliatory action; and he followed this line of argument at Greenock. Is the country, then, to entrust the Cabinet with the duty of determining what particular deviation from British working hours, wages, and legislative restriction, would require the imposition of a retaliatory duty upon imports alleged to have been produced under a 'sweating' or non-unionist system? If, as Mr Balfour's language seems to suggest, the Cabinet itself is to determine when 'outrageous unfairness' arises, and, on its own responsibility, to decide upon the retaliatory taxes that are to be imposed that is a policy that has never been ventured upon since Charles I attempted to raise taxes without the consent of Parliament; and it is not to be supposed that in so complex and delicate a matter as national trade, where the interests of the whole country are profoundly concerned, the nation will consent to leave its destinies to the haphazard control of any Cabinet that may happen to be in existence when the emergency arises.

While Mr Balfour pursues retaliation and hopes to avoid a general tariff war, Mr Chamberlain proceeds on his own course of undiluted protection. The assault upon free trade advances by two independent lines towards

the same end, but these are not always in harmony with each other. Mr Chamberlain has no fear of a general tariff war. Nor has he any hope, optimist as he says he is, of saving British trade, either in protected or in neutral markets, outside the empire, or even within the empire, unless we secure colonial reciprocity. Regardless of the exposure, already made, of the fallacies underlying his proposal to balance new food taxes by remissions upon sugar and tea, and leaving conveniently out of sight the consideration that a duty on foreign food and manufactures will raise the price of food and manufactures all round, Mr Chamberlain puts forward a provisional budget based on these lines, which, he hopes, will give a large bonus to home millers and cheap food for pigs. There is little hope, however, of rural milling being revived in any case. The large modern mills at Liverpool and near other ports would monopolise the trade as they do now. Mr Ritchie has exposed anew the looseness of Mr Chamberlain's reasoning. If foreigners paid the food tax, prices would not rise; and colonial and home farmers and millers could receive no benefit. And why exclude bacon and maize from taxation if the tax would not fall upon the consumer? If, on the other hand, the tax falls upon the consumer, the cost of living will be increased all round. Mr Chamberlain's remissions on tea and sugar would not only not compensate the consumer, but they would merely be remissions of war taxes that ought to come off in any case.

The important new feature, however, in the latest scheme is the proposal to put an average duty of 10 per cent. on imported manufactures, the duty being graduated so that it would fall lightest upon unfinished and heaviest upon finished goods, according to the labour that had been spent upon them. But the unfinished manufactures of one trade are the raw material of another; and, however light the taxation on unfinished manufactures might be, it would be a tax on the raw material of trades that use the unfinished goods. Yet Mr Chamberlain says he does not intend to tax raw material. The expression needs definition. The wheat that is to be taxed is the miller's raw material; leather the bootmaker's, bagmaker's, and saddler's; cloth, buttons, and thread, the clothier's; calico and linen the shirtmaker's; lace, feathers, ribbons,

untrimmed hats and bonnets, and dress materials the milliner's and dressmaker's; doors and window-frames the builder's; and iron and steel goods the raw material of innumerable trades. This means increased cost of living at every turn, and increased disadvantage in competing abroad. Where is the line to be drawn?

What the colonies will say to the proposals which Mr Chamberlain, without any definite authority, puts forward on their behalf, is hardly open to doubt. They will probably repudiate them without reserve. They have, it is true, pressed for preferential duties, and have made vague promises in return; but they have made it quite clear that they intend to retain their fiscal independence, for which Sir W. Laurier is ready even to face the risk of separation. In the face of such a declaration, what is the hope that Mr Chamberlain holds out? Canada, he says, has established her 'principal industries,' and 'you can never get rid of them'; but her 'secondary industries' are 'still open to you.' Australasia is less advanced, so that there are more industries open there; while in South Africa there are, practically, 'no industries at all.' What Mr Chamberlain is audacious enough to promise on behalf of the colonies is that henceforth they will start no new industries, but will 'leave them to us'; that they will pull down their tariffs in our favour where they are not necessary to the success of the policy to which they are committed; and that they will shut out foreign competitors by a high tariff wall, so that British manufacturers may enjoy a free run in 'all those numberless industries which have not yet been created.' In short, Mr Chamberlain does not expect the colonies to imperil the industries they have begun, but he expects them to say that henceforth they will never put on a new tariff against this country, but will for ever limit their industrial development to supplying Great Britain with food and raw material, while we continue to supply them with all the manufactures that they do not now produce. Mr Cobden is accused of not having foreseen that the nations of the world would not be content to remain hewers of wood and growers of food, and to leave England to supply them with manufactures. Mr Chamberlain, in regard to the colonies, has fallen into the same error. No self-governing colony would ever

consent to put on the fetters that he would forge; and, if it did, there would come a speedy end to all hopes of that industrial development which alone can bring about a large increase in the population of the colonies and in the general development of colonial prosperity, and therefore in our colonial trade. Mr Balfour was right when, in his letter of September 16 to Mr Chamberlain, he said the reciprocity scheme was impracticable, because it required 'a limitation in the all-round development of a protective policy.' A limitation that every colonist believes would, and is intended to, render impossible any further industrial development, is wholly impractical and chimerical, whatever the people of this country may say to the taxation of food.

And what does Mr Chamberlain offer in return? Is it not ludicrous to suppose that the paltry advantage of 2s. a quarter on corn and 5 per cent. on meat will induce the colonies to put a stop to their future industrial development? The proposal itself differentiates between the colonies, and between classes of producers within the colonies, in a manner likely to be detrimental to the cohesion of the empire which it is intended to promote. Australia will hardly look with satisfaction on a scheme which favours Canadian corn and New Zealand mutton, but leaves wool—by far her most important product—out of account. South Africa gains practically nothing by the scheme. And will the Canadian lumberman be satisfied if his neighbour the farmer alone reaps benefit from the Imperial connexion? If the object is to link the colonies to the mother-country by the tie of mutual commercial advantage, raw materials must follow food. The conventional separation of these articles is illogical; and there are irrefragable arguments, from the colonial point of view, for classing them together; while, on the other side, it is impossible to draw any intelligible line between raw materials and partly manufactured articles. All must, and certainly will, stand or fall together.

When Mr Chamberlain turns to the policy of retaliation his methods are all his own. His appeals are to the fears, the cupidity, and the passions of the people. He is 'always an optimist,' but, when he speaks of the future of British trade, he portrays impending ruin. His confidence in his own countrymen vanishes. Their inventive-

ness, their practical skill, their dogged resolution, their capacity to fight against all competitors, their great hold upon the trade of the world, all pass from his mind; he fixes his gaze upon the growing prosperity of other nations, and finds that they are all more prosperous than his own. He does not think other nations are all fools. That description is reserved for the British people, who have prospered under free trade, and do not see that ruin is impending over them.

Mr Chamberlain proposes, to begin with, an average tariff of 10 per cent. on manufactures, but lets slip the observation that other nations have passed tariff after tariff, beginning low, and subsequently advancing until the barrier became insurmountable. And it is this example that the British people are to emulate, on peril of mills and workshops being closed, men thrown out of work in thousands, and general ruin falling upon us all. But bar out foreign goods by high tariffs, and all industries will flourish; work will be abundant, wages will rise, and, though the cost of living may increase, agriculture will improve, and general prosperity will ensue.

On what groundwork of fact do Mr Chamberlain's pessimistic prophecies rest? British trade for the past thirty years, he says, has made no progress. Our review of the statistical position has shown that prices thirty years ago were just one half higher, on the whole, than they are now; and, if our present trade were measured by the values of thirty years ago, it would be seen that it had increased in volume by more than 50 per cent., and is giving employment to a correspondingly increased number of work-people. Mr Chamberlain says the silk trade has gone; but the average export of 'broad stuffs' of silk or satin and silk and other materials for the last five years has been 9,500,000 yards against 7,500,000 ten years ago, 6,000,000 twenty years ago, and 4,000,000 thirty years ago. Instead of the silk trade having gone, it has more than doubled in thirty years. The woollen and iron and steel trades, we are told, are threatened; and cotton will go next. All trades are always being threatened; but threatened men live long, and so do threatened trades. Our average consumption of wool during the last five years has been 526,000,000 lbs, against 344,000,000 lbs twenty years ago

and 320,000,000 lbs thirty years ago. Our average consumption of cotton for the last five years has been 15,000,000 lbs, against 11,800,000 lbs twenty years ago and 9,640,000 thirty years ago. Our output of pig-iron, too, and the consumption of pig-iron in the United Kingdom during the last five years, in spite of dumping from Germany and America, have been larger than in any similar period. The average pig-iron production for the last five years was 8,700,000 tons; twenty years ago it was 7,400,000 tons, and thirty years ago 5,900,000 tons; while the consumption of pig-iron for the last five years averaged 7,700,000 tons, twenty years ago 6,000,000 tons, and thirty years ago 5,100,000 tons. Silk, woollens, cotton, and iron and steel—all Mr Chamberlain's threatened or dying industries—instead of showing signs of decay, present higher figures than at any previous period in our history. But, says Mr Chamberlain, look at the tinplate trade; it has been ruined by the American tariff and American competition. The tinplate trade suffered severely from three causes. One was the American tariff; the second, old-fashioned methods in South Wales; and the third, continued disputes between South Wales employers and their workmen. There have been great reforms in South Wales, and masters and men have been pulling more together. The result is that more than two thirds of the tinplate trade that was lost in the States have been regained in other parts of the world; and American makers are unable to compete with South Wales makers in any market outside the States.

Such are the figures upon which Mr Chamberlain passionately asks working men, 'How long are you going to stand it?' and tells them that the men who depend upon the silk, cotton, woollen, and iron and steel industries are 'like sheep in a field. One by one they allow themselves to be led to the slaughter.' Some American reporter has stated, on the authority of an unnamed director of the Steel Trust, that the Trust, when business falls away in the States—as it is falling away—will not reduce its output, and will not blow out a single furnace, because it would turn into the streets hundreds of thousands of American workmen. Instead of reducing output, the Steel Trust is going to 'invade foreign markets.' Straightway Mr Chamberlain, without one moment's

investigation, accepts the whole story—how optimistic!—and uses it to scare British workmen into accepting a protective system by telling them that, if they do not, two years hence ten millions of tons of American iron will be dumped into this country, British workmen will be thrown out of employment in thousands, capitalists will be ruined, and we know not what besides. Yet the Steel Trust that is to do all this is even now, as we have shown above, reducing its output; it has just reduced its dividend to 2 per cent., which the majority of people think has not been earned; its shares are the shuttlecock of Wall Street; its late manager has retired, a broken man; and its future is by no means assured. If Mr Chamberlain had looked into official United States returns, he would have seen that, though under the Dingley tariff exports of iron and steel manufactures from the United States jumped up from \$41,000,000 in 1896 to \$122,000,000 in 1900, they had dropped in 1902 to \$98,500,000; while imports of iron and steel manufactures, after dropping from \$25,000,000 in 1896 to \$12,000,000 in 1899, had last year risen to \$27,000,000, which is higher by \$2,000,000 than before the Dingley tariff began.

It is upon such arguments as these that Mr Chamberlain apparently hopes to induce British workmen to enter upon a policy of retaliation; and, when it is suggested that foreign nations might retaliate again, he appeals to the fighting passions of his race and asks, 'Has it come to that with Great Britain? It is a craven argument.' What rhetorical bunkum is all this! Mr Chamberlain 'does not believe in a war of tariffs; but if there was to be a war, I know,' he says, 'we should not come out second best.' Perhaps not. But a wise man, before entering upon a war, sits down and counts the cost. Mr Chamberlain has not done that. He has not considered the gigantic losses which a tariff war inevitably entails on both parties. He has not even ascertained with accuracy the present state of trade and its recent history, nor has he considered the probable effect of a protective policy upon our trade with the colonies and with neutral nations. He neglects the fact that we cannot retaliate effectively upon most foreign nations—upon Russia and the United States, for instance—without taxing food or raw materials, or both. He has shown

that a protective system begins with low duties and ends with high ones; and under high duties Trusts arise. These secure control of the home market, which is what Mr Balfour wishes them to do. But control of the home market means that workmen, and all subsidiary trades and all consumers, are placed at the mercy of Trusts; and American and German experience teaches that their tender mercy is cruel. The country, it is to be hoped, will decline to hand itself, tied and bound, to Trusts that would flourish at the expense of the taxpayer, the workman, and the general consumer.

On the political confusion which the introduction of this burning question has produced, we have neither space nor mind to comment at any length. Like Mr Gladstone in 1886, Mr Chamberlain has, by his new departure, broken up one of the two great historic parties in the State. Like Mr Gladstone, again, Mr Chamberlain has brought not only unrivalled vigour of character, but also an unrivalled popularity, to the support of what, until he gave it his patronage, had been a despised and rejected creed. Protection, like the separate Irish Parliament, had been tried in former times, but had been deliberately replaced by a better plan. Protection, again, like the Irish Parliament, had been riddled and ridiculed by the statesman who, in altered circumstances, has advanced its claims. Mr Chamberlain, it is true, was not, as Mr Gladstone was, the recognised head of his party, but this makes little difference; every one knows the definition of a constitutional king. In spite of Mr Balfour's brave words at Sheffield, in spite of Mr Chamberlain's modest disclaimer at Glasgow, no one can doubt who is the real leader in this matter; nor will any one suppose that Mr Balfour would have advocated retaliation unless Mr Chamberlain had first urged retaliation *plus* reciprocity. The 'pioneer' is no mere pioneer, going forward under orders from the general in command of the army; he goes his own way; the army and the general follow.

It is this which the Duke of Devonshire seems to have perceived, if somewhat late. There is already considerable development between the 'Economic Notes' and the Sheffield speech. 'I approach the subject from the free-trade point of view.... I am a free-trader.... I throw

no doubt on the free-trade theory when expressed with due limitations'—this is the written word. 'I regard the controversy of 1846 as of no interest whatever to us now. . . . Do you desire to reverse the fiscal tradition, to alter fundamentally the fiscal tradition, which has prevailed during the last two generations? Yes, I do'—this is the spoken avowal. It must be allowed that the Duke of Devonshire has some defence.

And yet, what was said in the speech was implied in the pamphlet, to any one who read between the lines; and what was said at Glasgow was implied at Sheffield, to any one who observes the inevitable trend of financial change. Mr Balfour's half-way house 'is but a tent where takes his one day's rest A Sultan'—we forbear to finish the line. Retaliation will spell protection; and the only palliative of protection is reciprocity. Mr Chamberlain plays the stronger game, if only because he has the wider outlook, points to a higher ideal, and appeals not only to the pocket but to the heart. If the game is to be won at all, it will be won by his methods rather than by Mr Balfour's. But he has first to prove his primary contention—that the cohesion of the empire is in danger; and next, that his plan will save it from disruption. We dispute both these positions.

Circumstances are conceivable in which, for reasons of State, it might be well to reverse the policy of the last sixty years, and to encounter a commercial and industrial loss for the sake of a political gain. 'Salus populi suprema lex'; and if the empire could be saved only by surrendering the freedom of importation, free imports would have to go. But Mr Chamberlain has yet to prove that such a state of things exists; he has yet to show that mutually satisfactory terms can be arranged between the colonies and ourselves; he has yet to make clear the certainty of the political gain that would counterbalance so heavy a financial loss. And the gain would have to be great indeed; for he is a dangerous friend to the empire who goes about to weaken this country, on whose strength, after all, the empire primarily depends.

INDEX

TO THE

HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHTH VOLUME OF
THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

Acton, Lord, 'Cambridge Modern History,' 49-52.
Afghan War, The Second, 56—works on, 59. *See* Afghanistan.
 Afghanistan, policy of the British government, 59—invasions, *ib.*—Russian diplomacy, 60—Lord Lytton's negotiations with the Amir, 61—war declared and abdication of Sher Ali, 63—Sir Donald Stewart's administration of Kandahar, 63-65—memorandum on its strategical and political value, 65—negotiations with Yakub Khan, 67—Treaty of Gandamak, *ib.*—murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari, 68—occupation of Kabul, 70—engagement at Ahmud Khel, 71—Abdurrahman formally recognised Amir, 73—advance of Ayub Khan, 74, 76—defeat of the British at Maiwand, *ib.*—General Roberts' march on Kandahar, 75—result of the war, 77—demarcation of the north-west frontier, 79. *See also* Stewart, Field-Marshal.
 Africa, South, total value of imports, 253—food, 254.
 Africa, South, war in, Royal Commission of enquiry appointed, 581. *See* Cabinet.
 Agricultural Returns, statistics of fruit-growing, 383.
 America, submarine boats, 110.
 Aniline colours, development of, 469.
 Argentine Republic, returns of trade, 261.
Armstrong, Henry E., 'The Reign of the Engineer,' 462.
Armstrong, Lieut. G. E., 'Torpedoes and Torpedo Vessels,' 108.
 Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O., M.P., on submarine vessels, 105.

Arnold, Matthew, on the religion of Sophocles, 331.

Asia in Transformation, 155—breaking-up of the old divisions, 156—advance of Russia, 157, 171—influence in China, 158—in Tibet, *ib.*—north-eastern frontier states, 159—situation of Siam, 160—railway construction, 160-163—Mesopotamian project, 162—absorption of Persia, 164—its situation, 165—British influence in, *ib.*—resemblance between Persia and China, 166—internal condition of China, 167-169—British interests in, 169—Russian occupation of Manchuria, *ib.*—Imperial Chinese Customs, 170—position of Sir R. Hart, 171—internal condition of Russia, 172—system of government, 172-177.
 Australasia, total value of imports, 252, 253—food, 254.
 Austria-Hungary, policy of Leo XIII towards, 439-442—protest against the election of Cardinal Rampolla, 443, 459—policy in the Balkan States, 501.

B.

Bailey, L. H., 'The Principles of Fruit-growing,' 392.
 Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., M.P., on the position of the United States, 265.
 Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., M.P., his policy of retaliatory tariffs, 613. *See* Retaliation.
 Balfour, Lady Betty, on Lord Lytton's Indian administration, 59.
 Balkan States. *See* Macedonia.
 Barron, A. F., 'Vines and Vine Culture,' 381.
 Béarn, Mdme de, on her escape from the massacre at la Force, 145, *note*.
 Beauterne, Chevalier de, 'Sentiment

- de Napoléon sur le Christianisme,' 350.
- Beesly, A. H., 'The Life of Danton,' 128—on the condition of the peasantry, 139.
- Belgium trade, 626. *See* Retaliation.
- Belloc, H., character of his works on Danton and Robespierre, 127.
- Bonghi, Ruggiero, compiler of the Law of Guarantees, 445—on the relative rights of Church and State, *ib.*
- Booth, Charles, 'Life and Labour of the People in London: Religious Influences,' 231. *See* Religion.
- Bossuet, J. B., 'Histoire Universelle,' 31.
- Bourcet, General, on the duties of a Quartermaster-General, 598.
- Brodrick, Rt Hon. W. St. J., M.P., his rejection of Lord Roberts' proposed reforms in the army, 603, 608.
- Browning, R., his lines on Sophocles, 314.
- Bryce, James, 'Biographical Studies,' 554.
- Bulgaria, insurrection in Macedonia, 487—action of the Government, 492. *See* Macedonia.
- Buller, Sir R., on preparations for war, 590.
- Burgoyne, A. H., 'Submarine Navigation,' 126.
- Bushnell, D., his submarine boat, 108.
- Butcher, S. H., 'Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art,' 325, *note*, 333.

C.

Cabinet, The, and the War Office, 580—Royal Commission of enquiry appointed, 581—members, *ib.*—interpretation of its instructions, 582—584—supply of troops, 584—preparations for the war, 585—587—war, a form of political action, 587—need for harmony between policy and strategy, 588—596—Lord Wolseley's proposals, 589—strategy in the army, 596—duties of the General, *ib.*—the Quartermaster-General, 597—600—Adjutant-General, 601—Director of Intelligence, 602—Lord Roberts' proposal to restore the office of Quartermaster-General, 603—system in Germany, 604—Hartington Commission's Report, *ib.*—responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief, 605—Sir G. Chesney's scheme, 606—proposed reforms in the work of a military Administrator-General and a Com-

mander-in-Chief, 607—609—influence of strategy in the Cabinet, 610—proposed abolition of the office of Commander-in-Chief, 612—executive authority to a commission or board, *ib.*

Caldwell, Lieut. H. H., his evidence in favour of the Holland boat, 119.

Canada, conservation of the forests, 103—value of the export of timber, *ib.*—Forestry Association founded in 1900; 104—trade with Germany, 250—fiscal independence, *ib.*—result of preferential tariff, 251—total value of imports, 252, 253—food, and other products, 254—exports, 256—improved transit facilities, 270—quality of the wheat, 271—preferential tariff, *ib.*—relations with England, 272.

Carlyle, T., editions of his 'History of the French Revolution,' 128—character of the work, 130—his indifference to liberty, 131—view of the Revolution, *ib.*—omission of the 'Mercure de France,' 134—on the attempted legislation of the Assembly, 137—condition of the peasantry, 139, 142—his judgment of character, 142—on the character of Danton, 143.

Carmichael, A., 'Carmina Gadelica,' 21.

Castle, R. L., 'Packing and Selling Fruit and Vegetables,' 382, 397.

Cellarius, his world-history, 37.

Chamberlain, H. S., 'Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts,' 406. *See* 'Time-spirit.'

Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J., M.P., his Fiscal Policy, 246—Imperial aspect of the question, *ib.*—aim of his proposals, 247—preferential arrangements, *ib.*—exclusion of foreign countries, 248—opinions in the Colonies, 249—independent policy, *ib.*—reciprocity with Canada, 250—trade with Canada, 251, 271—on taxing foreign supplies of colonial products, 253—food imports, 254, 256—raw material, 255—effect of the new taxes on foreign countries, 257—on the United States, *ib.*—exclusion from the United States, *ib.*—result of reciprocity with the Colonies, 258—policy of retaliation, *ib.*—annual value of exports, 259, 262, 276—trade with Japan, 260—Hong Kong and China, *ib.*—South and Central America, 261—progress compared to other nations, 263—the 'dumping' ground, 265—on the 'dumping'

ground for American manufacturers, 266—on the depression of trade in Germany, *ib.*—the prospect of higher wages, 268—reconstitution of the educational system, 269—improved transit facilities, 270—relations with Canada, 272—France and the United States, *ib.*—opinions against his proposals, 273—on the total value of exports, 275—decreasing profits, 276—increase in trade, *ib.*—on the disappearance of industries, 277

Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J., M.P., his policy of protection, 637, 640. *See* Retaliation.

Channel Islands, acreage of orchards, 387—glass-houses, 401—supply of grapes and tomatoes, 402.

Cheal, J., 'Practical Fruit-Culture,' 391.

Chéradame, A., 'La Question d'Orient,' 163.

Chesney, Sir G., his proposed reforms in the War Office, 607.

Chilli, returns of trade, 261.

China, influence of Russia in, 158, 167—internal condition, 167—influence of Japan, 169—'East Asian League,' *ib.*—absorption of Manchuria by Russia, 169—Imperial Customs, 170—returns of trade, 260.

'Civiltà Cattolica,' extract from, on the supremacy of the papacy, 291.

Coal-tar colour industry, 468.

Colonies, trade, 626—views on retaliation and reciprocity, 642.

Colquhoun, A. R., 'Asia in Transformation,' 155.

Congresses, Apple and Pear, 381.

Cunningham, Dr W., on promoting free trade by retaliatory tariffs, 622.

Curzon, Lord, on the transformation of Asia, 155.

D.

Danton, his character, 143. *See* Revolution, The French.

Delpuech, Lieut. M., 'La Navigation Sous-marine à travers les Siècles,' 107.

Dessaint, A., 'Navigation Sous-marine,' 107.

Devonshire, Duke of, on free trade, 648.

Douglas, Prof. L., 'A History of Siena,' 179—character of his work, 183—omissions, *ib.* *See* Siena.

Droz, J., 'The History of Louis XVI,' 133—his impartial view of the Revolution, 134.

Dufferin and Ava, Lord, Viceroy of

India, 79—on the character and services of Sir Donald Stewart, 79.

E.

Education, defective system of, 476.

'Education, National,' extract from, 464.

Education, Technical, Reports of the Board, 466, 469, 474, 475, 478.

Electrical industry, 475.

Elsmie, G. R., 'Life of Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart,' 56.

Elton, Oliver, 'The Novels of Mr Henry James,' 358.

Engel, Georg, 'Über den Wassern,' 432.

Engineer, The Reign of the, 462—meaning of the word, *ib.*—problem of preserving our commercial position, 463—spread of the industrial system, 464—importance of economics, 465—influence of Liebig, 466—popularity of chemistry, 467—Lawes' experiments on manures, *ib.*—loss of the coal-tar industry, 468—Perkin's discovery of mauveine, 469—rosaniline, 470—transfer of the industry to Germany, *ib.*—reasons for the failure of industries, 471—comparison with Germany, 472—systematic training in research work, 473, 478—glass industry, 474—electrical industry, 475—advantages of scientific assistance, 476—defective system of education, 476—Report of the Technical Education Board, 478—need for co-ordination, 479—481—method of instruction, 481—484—'sandwich system,' 483.

Evelyn's 'Sylva,' 81, 88, 92.

F.

Fiscal Policy, Mr. Chamberlain's, 246. *See* Chamberlain.

Flemming, Professor, on the need of scientific assistance, 476.

Fletcher, C. R. L., his edition of Carlyle's 'History of the French Revolution,' 128.

Florence, works on, 178.

Forest, H., 'Les Bateaux Sous-marins,' 107.

Forestry, British, The Improvement of, 81—articles on, 81—85—history of timber cultivation, 85—meaning of the word 'forest,' 86—Acts for the Preservation of Woods, 87, 89, 90—efforts to promote the growth of timber, 88—report of a royal commission, 89—private planting, 90, 97—supplies of foreign timber, 91—number of acres of

- copsewoods, *ib.*—result of the fall in the value of timber, 92—committee appointed by Mr Hanbury, 93—need for the formation of pine and fir plantations, 94—number of acres of waste land, 95—estimate of returns, 96—expense of making plantations, *ib.*—state assistance, 97—instruction at universities, 99—demonstration areas, 100—instruction for foresters and woodmen, 101—result of experiment in Ireland, 102—conservation of forests in Canada, 103.
- France, La, et les Congrégations,** 515—la puissance de la papauté, 516—Pragmatique Sanction de 1268; 517, 526—la bulle de Boniface VIII, 517—Louis XI abolit la Pragmatique de Bourges, 518—Concordat de 1516 conclu entre François I^{er} et Léon X, 519—l'œuvre de l'Assemblée Constituante, *ib.*—le Concordat de 1801; 521—l'esprit de la Revolution, *ib.*—les couvents, 522—les moines, 523, 525—les prêtres séculiers, 524—les congrégations s'établissent sous l'obligation du triple vœu, 526—l'édit de l'Aguesseau, 527—jugements sur les congrégations, 528–530—un danger économique pour le pays, 530—le nombre des moines, *ib.*—les richesses accumulées, 531—la charité, les missions, et l'instruction, *ib.*—le programme des Jésuites, 532—Léon XIII sur l'enseignement universitaire, *ib.*—la loi Waldeck Rousseau, 534—extraits de la 'Loi de 1901,' *ib.*, *note*—l'application de la loi, 536–539—la dépense totale, 540—contradictions dans le système adopté par M. Combes, 542—suppression of the English Benedictine College at Douai, 543.
- France, submarine boats,** 110, 121—incidents in naval manoeuvres, 123—works on the Revolution, 127 *et seq.* (see Revolution)—her influence in Siam, 160—relations with England, 272—financial power of the religious confraternities, 295—policy of Leo XIII towards, 297.
- France, number of Theophilanthropists,** 345—policy of Leo XIII towards, 438—policy in the Balkan States, 504–506—trade, 626. *See* Retaliation.
- Frenssen, G., 'Jörn Uhl,'** 433.
- Fruit-Gardens and Orchards,** Our, 380. *See* Orchards.
- Fulton, R.,** his submarine boat, the Nautilus, 109.
- Fyfe, H. C., 'Submarine Warfare, Past, Present, and Future,'** 107.
- G.**
- Gael, The Sagas and Songs of the,** 2—number of tales and poems, 3—variety of their themes, 4—literary merits, 5—type of womanhood, 5–7—obscurity of language, 7—imperfect state of the different versions, *ib.*—Dr Stokes's translations, 8—'Death of Cuchulinn' and 'Voyage of Mael Duin,' *ib.*—'Second Battle of Moytura,' 9—'Siege of Howth,' 10—'Death of Muirchertach mac Erca,' 11—'Vision of MacConglinne,' 12–14—style of Mr Leahy's translations, 14—Miss Hull, *ib.*—defects of Lady Gregory's 'Cuchulain of Muirthemne, 15—nature of her alterations, 16—omissions, 17—her version of 'The Only Son of Aoife,' 18—characteristics of bardic poetry, 20—O'Grady's 'Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum,' 21—lyrical poetry, 22—nature-poems, 23—Mr Carmichael's 'Carmina Gadelica,' 24—blending of paganism and Christianity, 25—charms for veins and sprains, 26.
- Gaget, M., 'La Navigation Sous-marine,'** 107.
- Gasquet, Francis A.,** on the suppression of the English Benedictine College at Douai, 543.
- Germany, project of a Mesopotamian railway,** 162—freedom of trade, 250—trade with Canada, 251—imports, 253, 263—exports, 264—trade with Japan, 260—Hong Kong and China, *ib.*—Mexico, Chili, and Argentine, 261—result of the Socialist revolt, 266—system of education, 269—policy of Leo XIII towards, 298–302—the May Laws, 299.
- Germany, the nationality of,** 407—character of the literature, 413 (see 'Time-spirit')—policy of Leo XIII towards, 438—industrial progress, 466—influence of Liebig, *ib.*—coal-tar industry, 468—system of scientific research, 472—Technical High School at Charlottenburg, 479—policy in the Balkan States, 502—military system, 604—trade, 619, 621—advance of the tariff, 624—imports and exports, 625, 626, 628, 630—systems of 'dumping,' 631—method of Kartells, 632.
- Gerrare, W., 'Greater Russia,'** 170.
- Gladstone, Mr Morley's Life of,** 545. *See* Morley.

Glass industry, 474.
 Goethe, compared with Sophocles, 316-318—his influence on literature, 414.
 Gooch, G. P., 'The History of Mankind,' 28.
 Gourgaud, Général Baron, his 'Journal,' 352-354.
 Grapes, estimate of the supply, 402—amount imported, 403.
 Greece, policy towards Macedonia, 510.
 Greek genius, characteristics of, 332. *See* Sophocles.
 Gregory XVI, Pope, his treatment of Giocchino Pecci, 282—death, 283.
 Gregory, Lady, 'Cuchulain of Muirthemne,' 15. *See* Gael.
 Gyroscopic, use of, in submarines, 116.

H.

Haldane, Rt Hon. R. B., 'Education and Empire,' 463.
 Hall, A. D., 'The Soil,' 393.
 Helmolt, Dr H. F., 'The World's History,' 52-55.
 Henson, H. H., 'Religion and the Poor,' 230.
 Hewins, Prof., on commercial education, 465.
 Heywood, W., 'The "Ensamles" of Fra Filippo,' 191-193—his book on the Palio, 193—'Our Lady of August,' 194—'A Pictorial Chronicle of Siena,' 195.
 History, Universal, 38. *See* Mankind, The History of.
 Hofmann, Prof., his development of the aniline colours, 469.
 Hogg, Dr, 'Fruit Manual,' 381.
 Holland submarine, 117.
 Holland, trade, 626. *See* Retaliation.
 Hong Kong, returns of trade, 260.
 Hooper, C. H., 'Compensation for Fruit-planting,' 389-391.
 Huch, Riccarda, 'Aus der Triumphgasse,' 433.
 Hull, Eleanor, on the love-tales of Ireland, 6—her translations, 14—'Combat of Conall and Mesgegra,' 10, 14.
 Huxley, Prof., his estimate of Mr Gladstone, 555.
 Hysteria, phenomena of, 228. *See* Personality.

I.

India, her isolation a thing of the past, 157—north-eastern frontier states, 159—railway construction, 160—export trade, 249.
 India, trade, 626. *See* Retaliation.

Ireland, character of the literature, 2 (*see* Gael)—question of forestry in, 102.

Ireland, acreage of small fruit, 387—policy of Leo XIII towards, 456.
 Isle of Man, acreage of orchards, 387.
 Italy, policy in the Balkan States, 503—trade, 626. *See* Retaliation.

J.

Jackson, Basil, 'Waterloo and St Helena,' 354, *note*.
 James, Mr Henry, The Novels of, 358—style of his early books, 358-361—influences on his writing, 359—character of his men and women, 359, 363—style of his later books, 362—essay on London, 364—his preternatural stories, 365—'The Private Life,' 'Sir Edmund Orme,' and 'The Turn of the Screw,' *ib.*—mode of depicting young children, 366—'What Maisie Knew,' 'The Awkward Age,' and 'The Pupil,' 367—'The Beast in the Jungle,' *ib.*—'The Altar of the Dead,' 'The Great Good Place,' and 'The Sacred Fount,' 368—'The Wings of the Dove,' 369-379.
 Japan, situation, 167—influence in China, 169—'East Asian League,' *ib.*—return of imports, 260.
 Jebb, Sir R. C., character of his Greek verse, 321—his edition of Sophocles' plays, 322—character and aim of the work, 323.

K.

Kant, his treatise on a universal history, 36.
 Keller, Christoph, 37. *See* Cellarius.
 King, Bolton, 'History of Italian Unity,' 447, *note*.
 Kovalevski, M. W. de, 'La Russie à la fin du 19^e siècle,' 173.

L.

Lansdowne, Lord, on preparations for the war in South Africa, 590. *See* Cabinet.
 Laurent, F., 'Études sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité,' 34-36.
 Lavis, E., 'Histoire Générale,' 47-49.
 Lawes, Sir John, his experiments on manures, 467.
 Layard, Sir Henry, his 'Autobiography,' 485. *See* Macedonia.
 Leahy, A. H., 'The Courtship of Ferb,' 14.
 Leo XIII, Pope, 279—his character, 279, 281, 306—condition of the papacy, 280—at Viterbo, 281—

- enters the Collegio Romano, *ib.*—ordained priest, 282—his method of governing, Benevento, *ib.*—Perugia, 283—created Archbishop of Damietta and Nuncio to the Belgian government, *ib.*—personal vanity, 284—Archbishop of Perugia, *ib.*—relations with Victor Emmanuel, 285—'Cardinal Camerlengo,' 286—elected Pope, *ib.*—his policy, 287, 290, 306—character of his encyclical 'Inscrutabili Dei,' 288—290—'Quod Apostolici,' 291, 303—on the Thomist doctrine, 292—condemnation of the Rosminian philosophy, 293—development of the modern form of animism, 294—sources of revenue, 295, 296—his policy towards France, 297—Germany, 298—302—Ultramontanism, 302—sympathy with the working classes, 303, 305—'Rerum Novarum,' 303, 305—'Graves de communi re,' 304—his attributes, 306.
- Leo XIII, Pope, and his Successor,** 436—eulogies on, *ib.*—his policy towards Germany, 438—France, *ib.*—Austria-Hungary, 439—442—result of his opportunist policy, 443—hostile policy towards Italy, 444—448—the 'Non Expedit' policy, 449, 453—the clerical party, 450—French Catholics, 451—spirit of indifference, 453—financial condition of the Vatican, 454—number of pilgrims, 455—policy towards Ireland, 456—validity of Anglican orders, *ib.*—succession of Pius X, 458—461—extraits de ces Encycliques, 532—sa lettre au cardinal Richard, 536.
- Leo, his 'Weltgeschichte,'** 33.
- Lessing, G. E.,** his attempted study of Sophocles, 319.
- Lewes, G. H.,** on the social status of Goethe, 317.
- Liebig, his influence on scientific industries,** 466, 494.
- Lindner, T., 'Weltgeschichte,'** 44.
- Literature, German, The 'Time-spirit' in,** 404. See 'Time-spirit.'
- Lockyer, Sir Norman,** his address 'On the Influence of Brain-power on History,' 484.
- Lodge, Sir Oliver, 'The Survival of Personality,'** 211.
- M.**
- Macara, C. W.,** on the British cotton industry, 278.
- Macedonia and the Powers,** 485—origin of the 'movement,' 486—strength, 487—war of extermination against the Patriarchist party, 488—the Sultan's scheme of reforms, 490—the Austro-Russian plan, *ib.*—action of the Bulgarian government, 492—acts of the revolutionaries, 493—suppressive measures of the Turkish government, 494—recrudescence of the movement, 495—danger of war between Turkey and Bulgaria, 496—the Bulgaro-Macedonian element, 497—condition of Bulgaria, 498—Turkey, *ib.*—policy of Russia, 499—501—Austria, 501—Germany, 502—Italy, 503—France, 504—506—England, 506—Serbia, 507—the Albanians, 508—policy of Roumania, 509—Greece, 510—'The Committee for Autonomy,' 512.
- Mallet, B., 'Mallet du Pan,'** 128.
- Mankind, The History of,** 28—Herodotus the Father of History, *ib.*—the work of Polybius, 29—expansion of Rome and rise of Christianity, *ib.*—Chronicle of Eusebius, 30—work of Augustine, Orosius, and Ibn Khaldun, *ib.*—The Koran and 'Prolegomena,' 31—Bossuet's 'Histoire Universelle,' *ib.*—Condorcet, 32—Leo's 'Weltgeschichte,' 33—Laurent's 'Études sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité,' 34—36—Kant's treatise, 36—the work of Cellarius, 37—'An Universal History,' 38—the histories of Müller, Rotteck, 39—Schlosser and Weber, *ib.*—Weiss, 40—Ranke, 40—44—Lindner, 44—plan of co-operative history, 46—Oncken, *ib.*—Lavissee and Rambaud, 47—49—Lord Acton, 49—52—Dr Helmolt, 52—55.
- Manures, experiments on,** 467.
- Market Gardener's Compensation Act of 1895;** 388.
- Marshall, Professor, his pamphlet on 'National Education,'** 465.
- Mathieu, Cardinal, 'Le Concordat de 1801';** 522, 532, *note*.
- Menzies, W., 'Forest Trees and Woodland Scenery,'** 88, *note*.
- Mexico, returns of imports,** 261.
- Meyer, Kuno, on the number of Irish tales and poems,** 3.
- Midhat Pasha, Life of,'** 486.
- Montholon, Général Comte de, his notes on the religion of Napoleon I,** 352.
- Morley, Mr, Life of Gladstone,** 545—character of the work, 546—548—style, 548—on the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill, *ib.*—his contrarieties of tempera-

ment, 549—opportunism, 550—abolition of the income-tax, *ib.*—the Midlothian campaign, 551—tragedy of Majuba, *ib.*—his buoyancy and resource, 553—powers of self-persuasion, 554—characteristics, 555—560, 578—writings, 557—management of the Hawarden estate, *ib.*—private charities and benefactions, 558—qualities and gifts, 559, 578—oratory, 560—speech on the Affirmation Bill, 561—his knowledge of finance, 563—his views on colonial policy, 565—his foreign policy, 566—572—passion for economy, 572—attitude towards the problem of defence, 572—574—the Collier and Ewme appointments, 574—causes for the dissolution of 1874; 574—576—conversion to Home Rule, 571—578.

Müller, J. von, 'History of Switzerland,' 38—'Universal History,' 39.

Mun, Comte de, à une réunion de la Jeunesse Catholique, 533.

Myers, F. W. H., 'Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death,' 211 *et seq.* See *Personality*.

N.

Napier, Captain, 'History of Florence,' 178.

Napoleon I, The Religion of, 336—dislike of his father, 337—impressions from his mother, 338—early years, 339—study of Rousseau, *ib.*—essay on Christianity, 340—collapse of his enthusiasms, *ib.*—invasion of Italy, 341—respect for the Church as a governing power, 342—Egyptian expedition, *ib.*—overthrow of the Directory, 343—the Concordat of 1801—1802, *ib.*—on Catholicism, 344, 346—dislike of change, *ib.*—on Theophilanthropy, 345—Protestantism, *ib.*—relations with the Pope, 346—attitude towards the clergy, 347—towards opponents, 348—monologue on religion, 349—352—Monthon's notes, 352—Gourgand's 'Journal,' 352—354—his will, 355—357.

Nelson, Ensign, on the Holland submarine, 120.

New Zealand, export trade, 255.

Nichol, Prof., his life of Carlyle, 129.

Nicholas II, Emperor, character of his manifesto, 175.

Nietzsche, Fr., his influence on literature, 423—naturalism, 424—'The Dawn of Day,' 425.

Nisbet, J., 'The Improvement of British Forestry,' 81.

Noalhat, H., 'Les Bateaux Sous-marins,' 107.

Nordenfellt boats, 111. See *Submarine*.

Norman, H., 'All the Russias,' 157, 172.

O.

O'Grady, S. H., 'Catalogue of the Irish MSS. in the British Museum,' 21.

Oncken, W., 'Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen,' 46.

Onslow, Lord, on the falling away of industries, 277.

Oppenheimer, F., on the evils of high tariffs and 'dumping,' 635.

Orchards and Fruit-Gardens, Our, 380—congresses and exhibitions of fruit, 381—works on, *ib.*—the Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm, 382, 392, 398—statistics of fruit-growing, 383—acreage of orchards and small fruit in Great Britain, 384—387—obstacle to fruit-planting, 387—compensation to tenants, 388—custom in the Evesham district, 389—length of leases, 390—reduction of rent, *ib.*—advice to fruit-growers, 391—selection of a site, 392—markets, 393—suitable soils, 393—class of fruit, 394—profitable fruits, *ib.*—pruning, 395, 399—manure and cost of labour, 396—injury from frost, birds, and insects, *ib.*—packing, 397, 403—system of marketing, 397, 402—effect of grass on fruit-trees, 398—treatments of the surface soil, 400—glass-houses, 401—grapes and tomatoes, 403—home and foreign competition, *ib.*—imports of outdoor fruit, 403.

P.

Paul, H. W., his biography of W. E. Gladstone, 555.

Pecci, Gioacchino, 281. See *Leo XIII*.

Perkin, W. H., his discovery of mauveine, 469.

Persia, influence of Russia in, 164 167.

Personality, The Survival of, 211—the treatise of Mr Myers, *ib.*—advance of observation and experiment, 212, 224—telepathy, 213—mental impressions, *ib.*—'Phantasms of the Living,' 215—existence of a 'subliminal' self, *ib.*—meaning of the term, 216—feeling of an enlarged personality, 217—219—Mr Podmore's views on telepathy, 219—221—adaptation to environ-

- ment, 222—character of the two works, *ib.*—crucial tests, 223—future of useless faculties, *ib.*—the term *useless*, 224—unanimity of evidence, 226—conditions of a future life, *ib.*—end of the age, 227—hysteria, 228.
- 'Phantasms of the Living,' 215.
- Phillimore, J. S., 'Sophocles,' 334.
- Pius IX, elected Pope, 283—his opinion of Mons. Pecci, 284—death, 286—character of his protests, 288—admiration of the Rosminian philosophy, 293.
- Pius X, elected Pope, 458—his policy, 460.
- Playfair, Lord, on Liebig's tour through England, 466.
- Podmore, F., 'Modern Spiritualism: a History and a Criticism,' 219. *See* Personality.
- Poor, the, and Religion, 230. *See* Religion.
- Porson, his lecture on Euripides, 321.

Q.

- Quarterly Review, earlier articles on Forestry, 81-85, 90, *note*, 96, *note*, 97.

R.

- Rambaud, A., 'Histoire Générale,' 47-49.
- Rampolla, Cardinal, his character, 437—protest against his election, 443.
- Ranke, L. von, 'Weltgeschichte, 40—spirit of the work, 41-43—scope, 43—style, *ib.*
- Reciprocity and Retaliation, 613. *See* Retaliation.
- Religion and the Poor, 230—Mr Charles Booth's scientific inquiry into Christianity, 231—his choice of London, 232—despotism of class, 233—distribution of relief, 234-236—philanthropic advertisement, 236—denominational competition, 237—social element, 238—case of the Salvation Army, *ib.*—teaching of children, 239—moral power of Christianity, 240—unity of English-speaking Protestants, 242—character of the clergy, *ib.*—redemptive power of individual goodness, 243—'housing question,' 244.
- Retaliation and Reciprocity, 613—Mr Balfour's policy of a retaliatory tariff, 614, 638—export of coal, 615-617—industrial supremacy of England, 617—growth of competing industries, 618—conditions in Germany, 621—United States, *ib.*—

trade characteristics of the past thirty years, 622, 636—the first period, 622—second, 623-625—third, 625—average annual value of exports, 626—imports, 627—statistics of trade with the United States, 629, 631—shipping, *ib.*—systems of 'dumping,' 630-632—iron and steel trade, 630-634—Mr Oppenheimer on the evils of high tariffs and 'dumping,' 635—result of the Dingley tariff, 636—Mr Chamberlain's policy, 637, 640 *et seq.*—his proposed taxation of imported manufactures, 641, 644—views of the colonies, 642—Increase of trade, 644—the Steel Trust, 645—political situation, 647.

Revolution, The French, New Lights on, 127—works on, 127 *et seq.*—condition of France, 131—character of the Assembly, 135—attempted legislation, 136—state of the peasantry, 139-141—the prelates, 141—character of Danton, 143—his venality, *ib.*—complicity in the massacres, 144-148—humanity, 146—opponent of the Girondists, 148—organiser of the Terror, 149—character of Robespierre, 151, 152—sources of his influence, 153—incapacity for action, *ib.*

Roberts, Lord, 'Forty-one Years in India,' 59—his march on Kabul, 70—on Kandahar, 75.

Roberts, Lord, his proposal to restore the office of the Quartermaster-General, 603—reform in the War Office, 608.

Robertson, J. G., 'A History of German Literature,' 430.

Robespierre, his character, 151, 152—appearance, *ib.* *See* Revolution.

Rose, J. H., his edition of Carlyle's 'History of the French Revolution,' 129.

Rotteck, Karl von, 'Allgemeine Geschichte,' 39.

Roumania, policy towards Macedonia, 509.

Rousseau, M. Waldeck, 'Associations et Congrégations,' 534.

Royal Academy, The, and Reform, 196—rise and constitution, 196-198—condition, 199—reform of the constitution, 200-204—position as an exhibiting body, 204-207—as an educational body, 207-209.

Royal Horticultural Society, fruit shows, 381.

Russia, expansion in Asia, 60—war with Turkey, 62—extension of the

Empire, 157, 171—influence in China, 158, 167—in Tibet, *ib.*—construction of railways, 160—influence in Persia, 164, 167—absorption of Manchuria, 169—internal condition, 172—system of government, 172-177—religious freedom, 173—functions of the *zemstvos*, 174—manifesto of the Emperor, 175—character of the nobility, *ib.*—the peasantry and middle class, 176—colonists, *ib.*

Russia, policy in the Balkan States, 499-501—trade, 626. *See* Retaliation.

S.

Sagas and Songs of the Gael, 1.
See Gael.

Salisbury, Lord, on Mr Gladstone, 579.

Salvation Army, work of the, 238.

Schellendorf, General B. von, his treatise on the Prussian General Staff, 604.

Schlosser, the founder of the Heidelberg school of historians, 39—his works, *ib.*

Schopenhauer, his influence on literature, 423.

Scott, Sir Walter, 'On Planting Waste Lands,' 82—'On Ornamental Plantations and Landscape Gardening,' *ib.*

Sepoy Mutiny of 1857; 57, 80.

Servia, attitude towards the Macedonian question, 507.

Siam, influence of France in, 160.

Sichel, Walter, "Time-spirit" in German Literature, 404.

Siena, 178—history, 180—wars, *ib.*
—government, 181—Petrucci dynasty, 182—Professor Douglas's 'History,' 183—character of the Sieneze, 184—literature, 185—chivalry and piety, 186—arts, *ib.*
—architecture, 187—painting, 187-191—works of Mr Heywood, 191-195.

Sifton, C., on the Canadian preferential tariff, 271.

Sophocles and the Greek Genius, 307—his happy temperament, 308—date of his birth, 309—father, 310—boyhood, 311—influence of Æschylus, *ib.*—position in society, 312 political wisdom, 313—domestic relations, 314—his many-sided character, 315—religion, 315, 331—compared with Virgil, Tennyson, 216—Goethe, 316-318—fame, 319—Sir R. Jebb's edition of his plays, 320-321—characteristics, 324, 330,

334—style, 325—his use of the chorus, *ib.*—sweetness, 326—accused of plagiarism, *ib.*—'Œdipus Tyrannus,' 327—'Antigone,' 327-330.

Stephen, Sir J., his Commission of 1887; 611.

Stewart, Field-Marshal Sir Donald, his character, 56, 80—appointed to the Bengal Infantry regiment, 57—at the taking of Delhi, *ib.*—the siege of Lucknow, 58—deputy adjutant-general, *ib.*—advance on Kandahar, 63—character of his administration, 64—on the strategical and political value of Kandahar, 65—in command of southern Afghanistan, 69—march on Kabul, 71—battle of Ahmad Khel, *ib.*—negotiations with Abdurrahman, 73—on the defeat at Maiwand, 74—evacuation of northern Afghanistan, 75—Commander-in-Chief of the Indian army, 78—on the frontier policy, *ib.*—member of the council, 79. *See also* Afghanistan.

Stokes, Dr W., 'Death of Cuchullinn,' 8 *et seq.* *See* Gael.

'Subliminal' self, meaning of the term, 215.

Submarine, The, 105—construction, 106—works on, 106-108, 126—attempts of Drebbel, 108—Bushnell's boat, 109—Fulton's boat the Nautilus, *ib.*—the Plongeur, 110—American Davids, *ib.*—Nordenfelt boats, 111—qualifications, *ib.*—submergence and flotation, 111-113—steadiness of keel, 113—vision and movement without divergence, 114—the Whitehead torpedo, 115—use of the gyroscope, 116—two methods of propulsion, *ib.*—the Holland boats, 117-120—the Lake Argonauts, 120—the Protector, *ib.*—French submarines, 121—incidents in naval manoeuvres, 123—experiments with a torpedo-boat destroyer, 124—views on, 125.

Sudermann, his influence on literature, 426—'Helmuth,' 428.

Survival of Personality, The, 211.
See Personality.

Sykes, Major P. M., 'Ten Thousand Miles in Persia,' 165.

T.

Taine, his work on the French Revolution, 138.

Tariffs, preferential. *See* Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.

- Tariffs, retaliatory, 613. *See* Retaliation.
- Telepathy, faculty of, 213.
- Thomas, D. A., on the export of coal, 616.
- Thompson, R., 'The Gardener's Assistant,' 382.
- Thursfield, J. R., on naval training, 462, *note*.
- 'Times,' letters in the, on 'The Middle-Eastern Question,' 155, 165.
- 'Time-spirit' in German Literature, 404—tendencies of the nineteenth century, *ib.*—Herr Chamberlain's work, 406—on German nationality, 407—war of races, 408—date of modern history, *ib.*—his meaning of the word 'Germanic,' 409—the Jews, *ib.*—distinction between 'race' and 'nationality,' 411—nationality ideal individuality, 412—character of the literature, 413—Influence of Goethe, 414—the Romantic school, 414–416—'Young Germany,' 416—David Strauss, 417—the feminine strain, 418—Influence of Auerbach, *ib.*—'actuality' contrasted with 'realism,' 419—psychological influences, 420—works of Freytag, *ib.*—Countess of Hahn-Hahn, Scheffel and Spielhagen, 421—Paul Heyse, Storm, and Fontane, 422—Schopenhauer, 423—Nietzsche, 423–425—tenour of dramas, 426—Sudermann, 426–430—Hauptmann, 430—other writers, 431–434—contradictions of the 'Time-spirit,' 434.
- Tomatoes, production of, 402.
- Trans-Caspian railway, 161.
- Trans-Siberian railway, 160.
- Turkey, Sultan of, his scheme of reforms, 490—suppressive measures, 494. *See* Macedonia.
- Turkey, war with Russia, 62.
- Turner, G. J., 'Select Plans of the Forest,' 87.

U.

- United States, trade, 252, 253, 276—exclusion of British manufactures,

- 257—result of import duties on food products, *ib.*—trade with Japan, 260—Hong Kong and China, *ib.*—Mexico, Chili, and Argentina, 261—operation of 'dumping,' 262, 265—economic position, 265—causes of progress, 269—relations with England, 272.
- United States, trade, 619, 621, 626, 628, 629—iron and steel trade, 630—the Wilson and Dingley tariffs, 631, 633, 634, 637, 646—system of 'dumping,' 632

V.

- Viebig, Clara, 'Das Tägliche Brot,' 432.
- Villari, Professor, 'First Centuries of Florentine History,' 178.

W.

- War Office, The, and the Cabinet, 580. *See* Cabinet.
- Webb, Sidney, on the University of London, 479.
- Weber, Georg, 'Lehrbuch der Weltgeschichte,' 39—'Allgemeine Weltgeschichte,' *ib.*
- Weiss, J. B., 'Weltgeschichte,' 40.
- Whigham, H. J., 'The Persian Problem,' 163, 164.
- Wichert, 'Hinkefuss,' 432.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, von, on the plety of Sophocles, 315.
- Wildenbruch, Ernst von, 'Neid,' 434.
- Wilkinson, Spenser, 'The Cabinet and the War Office,' 580.
- Willert, P. F., 'New Lights on the French Revolution,' 127.
- Woburn Experimental Fruit Farm, reports on, 332, 392, 398.
- Wolseley, Lord, on preparations or the war in South Africa, 589.
- Wright, John, editor of the 'Journal of Horticulture,' 381—'The Fruit-Growers' Guide,' 382—his essay on 'Profitable Fruit-growing,' *ib.*

END OF THE HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHTH VOLUME.

ood
an,
1—
5—
of
ng-
28,
330
7s,
of

st,
ica

st,
of
lt-
lt-

o-

ne

4.

et

ne

n,

or

al

t-

n